ments. While it is true that the Executive can veto a bill, the ultimate power still lies in the Congress while it is in session by the overriding veto. But there is a vast area of power consciously not made explicit by the framers of our Constitution who were aware of the curbs placed on the Executive without corresponding explicit curbs which the Executive could use in its relationship with the Congress, and it is in the use of this area that a President fails or succeeds in the government of his country.

It is because the fathers of this country had an image of what the President must be to match the responsibility of the office—decisive, subtle, informed, and imaginative—that this area of power exists. When the office of the President is filled with a man limited in the exercise of these qualities, the country must suffer. So it is today.

We have had, unfortunately, too many commissions and not enough decisions. We have had a reliance on the resonant phrase: "dynamic massive retaliation"; "liberation"; "agonizing reappraisal", to catch the public mind. We have had to swing around from "liberation" to "containment." We have had an unleashing and a re-leashing of the Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa. We have had decisions made, remade, and un-made again, from the first decision that the Tachen Islands are vital to our defense to the un-made decision to evacuate the Tachens. We have had the decision of defending Quemoy and the Matsu Islands through the promise of Secretary Dulles to Chiang Kai-shek and again through "implications" in Mr. Dulles' foreign policy statement of last week. Now we are not quite sure what the decision will be since the President's statement to the Senate on the Formosa resolution. We have had the decision to defend Dien Bien Phu and then the decision not to defend Dien Bien Phu. What was at first the relentless decision not to consider the Chinese Communist government as either de facto or de jure, we now seek, through the language of the Formosa treaty and through the efforts of cease-fire, to bring ourselves to the point of acknowledging the existence of two Chinese governments, one for the mainland and one for Formosa.

I do not quarrel with some of the decisions that have ultimately been made; I make only the point of the circuitous, contradictory routes that have been passed through to reach them.

Perhaps the severest test placed upon the office of the Presidency is that of silence. In the delicate operations of negotiation upon which, perforce, the conduct of foreign affairs must hinge, there are changes from day to day which alter or amend earlier decisions. The volume and the complexity of such exchange among governments can be known to the President alone. The public cannot know what they are, nor should they. I am talking, mind you, of the day-to-day exchange among governments. Hence a dramatic announcement of policy must be watched lest it be tainted with the poison of prematurity.

We have seen just such a public scramble relative to the now ex-Premier of France, Mendes-France. It was first the violence directed against him in the repudiation of EDC by France, and then the reassessment upon the completion of the Paris agreements. Our policy in the Far East has been paralyzed by public statements emanating from the White House. Good intentions are not a substitute for firmness, nor overeagerness for public approval a substitute for delicacy and imagination.

This, of course, is not a brief for the withholding of information from the public. It is, rather, a reminder that the hasty jumping into public print carries with it a danger that public opinion, unaware of new and subtle developments, may compel a rigidity in the operation of foreign affairs which new developments no longer warrant. This eagerness for public announcement has already resulted in unnecessary confusion at home and abroad and has left the unwarranted impression that the United States leaps before it looks.

Hamilton has said it well in discussing the powers of the President:

"In the article which gives the legislative powers of the Government, the expressions are, 'All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.' In that which grants the executive power, the expressions are, 'The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States.' The enumeration ought therefore to be considered, as intended merely to specify the principal articles implied in the definition of executive power; leaving the rest to flow from the general grant of that power, interpreted in conformity with other parts of the Constitution, and with the principles of free government."

It is well that those of us who are concerned with the conduct of government become increasingly aware of the relationship between the office of the President and the Congress of the United States. The indispensable factor must be Presidential initiative. There has been—unfortunately, I say, despite the fact I am a Member of Congress—a growing dependency upon congressional support, in the conduct of our foreign affairs particularly. If this tendency develops to too great a degree, we shall find a radical disturbance in the distribution of powers, an imbalance which bodes ill for the country.

This growing imbalance can only be redressed by the man who, by the strength of his visions, understands the responsibilities, duties, and the powers of the office of the President.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose throne is truth, frail creatures of dust serving out our brief day on the world's vast stage, we would set our little lives in the midst of Thine eternity and feel Thy completeness flowing around our incompleteness, and around our restlessness Thy rest.

As we face together the tasks of another week, we come asking that Thou wilt give us a rebirth of faith, because when faith dies the deepest meanings of our lives fold up their tents and disappear; but if faith returns, in ourselves, in others, and in Thee, then life again clothes itself with purpose and significance and we have treasures worth living and worth dying for. And so, pausing by this wayside shrine in prayerful penitence, we do not ask for easy lives, but for great reserves; we do not ask that our path should be smooth, but that we should never lose our direction or become dismayed.

Make us ever mindful that upon the free soil of this continent our fathers, with holy toil, reared a house of faith hallowed by Thy name. Make us so to believe in America and so to add to its strength and stamina by our own characters that we shall covet for the whole world its emancipating truth and light in the midst of today's falsehood and darkness. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 18, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 19, 1955, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 145) to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as a member of the United States delegation to attend the inauguration of the President of Cuba, and inasmuch as I shall be leaving for that purpose tomorrow morning, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning tomorrow, and for the remainder of the week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security

Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR THE LATE SENATOR MAYBANK, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, at this time I should like to announce to the Senate that on March 2, 1955, there will be held in the Senate a memorial service for the late Senator Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I announce that at a meeting of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, on Friday, February 18, 1955, the following were elected for the first session of the 84th Congress: Representative OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, chairman; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], vice chairman. I make this announcement in order that the RECORD will show their election.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RUNNING MATES FOR CERTAIN STAFF CORPS OFFICERS IN NAVAL SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INTERCHANGE OF SUPPLIES BETWEEN THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXEMPTIONS FROM DUTY OF CERTAIN PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 27, 1942 (ch. 453, 56 Stat. 461), as amended, to make permanent the exemptions from duty of personal and household effects, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION ON OPERATIONS UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period October 1 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD AND MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SECURITY PROVISIONS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WILLIAM HENRY DIMENT ET AL.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Mr. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment and Mrs. Gladys Everingham (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States against the enactment of legislation lowering the tariffs on the importation of rubber products

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress H. R. 1, which provides for the lowering of tariffs on the importation of certain manufactured products, including manufactured rubber goods; and

"Whereas adequate tariffs must be maintained to enable American manufacturers of rubber goods to remain in business and sell their products in the domestic market—the last market left to them; and

"Whereas the rubber manufacturing industry, founded in America and which, at one time, sold its goods throughout the world, cannot fairly compete with foreign manufacturers who have copied the American product but have exploited their one advantage of cheap labor: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to defeat H. R. 1; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress thereof to consider revision of the Sugar Act of 1948 in regard to sugar quotas established for domestic sugar beet production

"Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, provides a statutory limitation upon the quantity of sugar which may be marketed in the United States during any 1 year by the domestic beet, mainland cane, Hawaiian, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands sugar industries; and

"Whereas since the establishment of these inflexible marketing quotas the population of the United States has increased from approximately 150 million to more than 163 million persons and the consumption of sugar has increased approximately 1 million tons since 1948 as a result of the increased population; and

"Whereas sugar consumption in the United States may be expected to continue to increase at a rate of 100,000 to 125,000 tons per year; and

"Whereas under provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, the domestic sugar industry has been prevented from participating in this increase in consumption by the inflexible marketing privileges; and

"Whereas an equitable and participating share of this expanding market is essential to the continued stability and vigor of the domestic sugar industry; and

"Whereas the beet sugar industry is prepared to meet the challenge of an expanding market due to achieved gains in productivity and efficiency; and

"Whereas the welfare of our State and our Nation requires the existence of a strong and vigorous domestic sugar industry, especially during periods of war and national emergencies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 40th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That all members of the Congress of the United States are urged to enact legislation amending the Sugar Act of 1948 in such manner as to enable the domestic sugar industry to have fair and equitable participation in the growth of our Nation; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Interior, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of

the United States, and to each Member from Colorado of the Congress of the United States.

"STEPHEN R. NUNECHOP,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIEA,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

Four joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States and to the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"We, representatives of the citizens of Alaska, again appeal to you, the duly constituted representatives of all the people of the United States, that you may recognize us and our constituency as equal citizens under the democratic flag of America;

"We remind you again that the people of Alaska have demonstrated through all their history of Territorial status their adherence to the principles upon which the Government of the United States was founded;

"We remind you that by referendum and by acclamation through our land an overwhelming majority of our people have declared unequivocally their desire for statehood and the right of a free people to govern themselves;

"We recall to you that your own electors, through the platforms of the major political parties and by their popular accord have given you a mandate for statehood for Alaska; and

"Therefore we ask that you, collectively and as individuals, dismiss all partisan concerns, look only to the merits of our cause, recognize and correct the injustice we suffer in not being allowed to govern ourselves or participate in the election of the President or have voting representation in Congress, all of which may be cured by enabling immediate statehood for Alaska.

"Your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house January 25, 1955.
"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:
"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 8, 1955.
"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:
"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"House Joint Memorial 3

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the Federal Government retains the responsibility for care and treatment of the mentally ill in Alaska; and

"Whereas the existing procedures for the care and treatment of such persons in Alaska are antiquated, inhuman, and cruel; and

"Whereas this condition is a matter of grief and shame to all the people of Alaska, who plead to us, their duly elected Representatives and their Delegate to Congress for immediate correction of this deplorable condition; and

"Whereas H. R. 610, a bill to correct this condition is pending before the Congress of the United States.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska urges that this legislation be passed and approved.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house January 27, 1955.
"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:
"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 8, 1955.
"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:
"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas under the law of the United States the States therein receive the benefit of 90 percent of the profits from the leasing of coal and certain other mineral lands therein; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska is discriminated against in the benefit of profits from these mineral lands under existing Federal law; and

"Whereas H. R. 247, a bill to correct this discrimination now existing, is pending before the Congress of the United States.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urges that this legislation be passed and approved, thereby eliminating this unfair discrimination.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house January 27, 1955.
"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:
"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 5, 1955.
"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:
"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

"To the President of the United States; the Congress of the United States; and the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the great need for the economy of Alaska is industrial development and use of its natural resources; and

"Whereas an opportunity for a large wood-processing industry at Shoemaker Bay, near Wrangell, Alaska, is immediately available in matured plans of the Pacific Northern Timber Co., which has timber-use rights in this area under contract with the United States Forest Service; and

"Whereas development of this $2,500,000 plant cannot be achieved without ownership and use of certain tidelands, adjacent to and abutting on upland property owned by the Pacific Northern Timber Co., which are presently held in trust by the United States for the State of Alaska and the ownership rights to which tidelands can be obtained only by an act of Congress; and

"Whereas we, the duly elected representatives of the people of Alaska, hereby record our findings and belief that the tidelands involved should be committed to the industrial use here proposed.

"Therefore, we ask that you immediately enact legislation authorizing the issuance of a patent conveying fee simple title to those certain necessary tidelands in Shoemaker Bay to the Pacific Northern Timber Co., the issuance of the patent to be conditioned on the faithful performance by the company of its agreement with the United States Forest Service to construct sawmill facilities at the site by December 31, 1957.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 14, 1955.
"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:
"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house February 14, 1955.
"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:
"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Approved by the Governor February 17, 1955.
"B. FRANK HEINTZLEMAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 2

"Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation withdrawing all tribal lands of the Papago Indian Reservation except lands previously patented or now subject to valid mining claims, from all forms of mineral entry and location, and directing that the mineral rights in said reservation be held in trust by the United States for lease for mining purposes for the benefit of the Papago Indians on the same terms and conditions as mineral rights are leased in other Indian reservations in Arizona

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Papago Indian Reservation, created by Executive Order 2524 and extended by statute (46 Stat. 1202), is subject to mineral entry and location under the mining laws of the United States.

"Except for the mining laws of the United States and Arizona, the said right of entry is not subject to any control by the United States or by the Papago Tribe.

"Said right of location has caused hardship to numerous Papago Indians in the past by forcing them to move from their homes and fields and by depriving them of desirable lands and waterholes.

"Due to the great interest of the general public in the possibility of discovering uranium ore on the reservation, there is great fear among the Papago Indians that they will be deprived of their reservation piecemeal by mining claimants.

"The Papago Indian Reservation does not have adequate resources to support the population presently living there and the possibility of substantial mineral discoveries seems the only hope that the reservation can provide an adequate economic base for the Papago people.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona prays:

"That the Congress of the United States withdraw all tribal lands of the Papago Indian Reservation, except lands previously patented or now subject to valid mining claims, from all forms of mineral entry and location and directing that the mineral

rights in said reservation be held in trust by the United States for lease for mining purposes for the benefit of the Papago Indians on the same terms and conditions as mineral rights are leased in other Indian reservations in Arizona."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 23

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts

"Whereas Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court have, through numerous opinions and decisions, invaded the fields of the legislative and executive branches of Government; and

"Whereas through numerous opinions and decisions Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court have invaded the field of government which should be left to the control of the several States of the Union; and

"Whereas Congress is authorized under the Constitution of the United States to control and limit the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress be memorialized to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts so that the fields of the government of the executive and legislative branches and that of the several States shall not be invaded, but shall remain separate and distinct; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from Alabama, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from Alabama, the Senate of the United States, and the House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent, that:

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers issued, on June 23, 1954, a progress report on the Libby project, which project is located on the Kootenai River, which heads in Canada and crosses the Canadian-United States boundary into the State of Montana and from there crosses the Montana-Idaho line at Leona, Idaho, in Boundary County, Idaho, from which point it runs in a westerly direction to Bonners Ferry, Idaho, and then meanders northerly to the Canadian-United States boundary line and back into Canada; and

"Whereas the Libby project recommended in said report would be a multipurpose project, accomplishing the following, among other purposes:

"1. Power: The firm power capability of Libby Dam's at-site generating capacity will be 292,000 kilowatts. However, total firm power production resulting from the stream regulation by Libby Dam will amount to 1,150,000 kilowatts.

"2. Flood-control protection for 70,000 acres of agricultural and stock-raising lands in the Kootenai Flats region between Bonners Ferry, Idaho, and downstream to Kootenay Lake, British Columbia, Canada.

"3. The 95-mile-long reservoir also will provide incidental navigation and recreational benefits; and

"Whereas this power is urgently needed to relieve the power shortage in the region; and

"Whereas the Kootenai Flats area, which includes 36,000 acres in northern Idaho and 34,000 acres in British Columbia, is the victim of almost annual flooding despite levee work and other flood-protection measures and extensive flood-fighting efforts. The emergency became so great in 1954 that the Governor of the State of Idaho called upon the Army and all other available forces for assistance, resulting in mobilization of a flood-fighting force of 1,000 men, 155 dump trucks, 34 bulldozers, and 22 power shovels. This force went to work on a 24-hour basis over the 50-mile reach of the Kootenai River and about 100 miles of levees. A preliminary estimate of the total damage, including the cost of this operation, but not including the damage in Canada, was $1,400,000; and

"Whereas said dam would improve navigation and recreation benefits on said river: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America that the report of the Corps of Engineers be approved, that the project be authorized, and that funds be made available for its construction at the earliest possible date; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Chairman of the United States section, International Joint Commission, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State and from the State of Montana.

"The senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 29th day of January 1955.

"CARL D. IRWIN,
"President pro tempore of the Senate.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 11th day of February 1955.

"R. H. YOUNG., Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Reprcsentatives.

"I hereby certify that the within Senate Joint Memorial 2 originated in the Senate during the 33d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

"ROBERT H. REMAKLUS,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934 and subsequent Federal aid highway acts to provide for the elimination of provisions which would deprive those States of Federal highway aid which are spending motor-fuel and motor-vehicle tax receipts for nonhighway purposes

"Whereas the State for many years has been contributing to the Federal Government through the Federal gasoline tax substantial amounts in excess of the amounts of Federal highway aid received; and

"Whereas the Federal Government for many years has been diverting to other than highway purposes substantial amounts of highway user revenues collected in New Jersey and the other States; and

"Whereas for these and other reasons it seems presumptuous for the Federal Government to assume the right to deprive New Jersey and other States of the return of their own tax money in the form of aid because they choose to spend their State tax revenues in a manner not approved by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to amend the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934 and subsequent Federal aid highway acts by providing for the elimination of the provisions under which the Federal Government withholds highway aid from States failing to use at least the amounts provided by law (in 1934) 'from State motor-vehicle registration fees, licenses, gasoline taxes, and other special taxes on motor-vehicle owners and operators of all kinds for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of highways and administrative expenses in connection therewith, including the retirement of bonds for the payment of which such revenues have been pledged, and for no other purposes.'

"2. The Secretary of State is hereby directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this joint resolution, properly authenticated to the President of the United States, to the respective presiding officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and to all of the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey in the Congress.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

A resolution adopted by the Yucaipa Valley Real Estate Board, California County, Calif., relating to the processing of FHA applications in that area; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Anchorage, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide statehood for Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of San Diego County, Calif., endorsing Joint Resolution No. 3 adopted by the California legislature, relating to the cooperation of the Federal Government with the celebration of the centennials of the opening of the Pacific Overland Mail (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions signed by William D. Holland and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relative to treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Morning Star Council 294, the Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate joint resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to extend the emergency drought relief feed program

"Whereas the beef and dairy section of the South has suffered a long period of drought; and

"Whereas the severe freezing weather recently experienced, combined with the drought, has generally retarded the growth of grain crops and in many instances completely destroyed winter pastures: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress is memorialized to extend the emergency drought-relief-feed program for at least 60 days beyond the expiration date now provided; be it

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to each of the United States Senators from South Carolina and each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States from South Carolina and to the clerk of the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing South Carolina's Members in Congress to take whatever action is appropriate or necessary to obtain Federal funds for a survey of the possibilities and practicability of irrigation and drainage in South Carolina

"Whereas farmers and all agricultural agencies are actively participating in a long-range farm program for the betterment of the country, of agriculture, and of the people as a whole; and

"Whereas in a number of States the normal waterfall is not sufficient to provide productive lands; and

"Whereas the economy of South Carolina is basically agricultural; and

"Whereas droughts of recent years have brought great losses to the farmers of this State; and

"Whereas in South Carolina there are often times when the water supply is not normal and, though there may be sufficient total rainfall, it is not certain during the times when needed most; and

"Whereas under modern farming procedures, localities that have resorted to irrigation have succeeded in producing substantial gains in crops and have made certain the time of harvest; and

"Whereas there is a trend toward irrigation in many localities all over the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the two United States Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from South Carolina be memorialized to take whatever action is appropriate or necessary to obtain Federal funds for a survey of the possibilities and practicability of irrigation and drainage in South Carolina; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the United States Senators and each Member of the United States House of Representatives from South Carolina."

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO CHILDREN OF CERTAIN EX-MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the granting of educational benefits to children of members of the Armed Forces killed in combat during World War II, and in Korea.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to pass legislation granting educational benefits to children of members of the Armed Forces killed in combat during World War II and in Korea

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill to grant educational benefits to children of members of the Armed Forces killed in combat during World War II and in Korea; and

Whereas approximately 100,000 children in the United States are now likely to be deprived of the advantages of an education or livelihood that would have been theirs had they been provided for by their fathers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact into law such proposed legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 58. Resolution to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 34); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably seven original resolutions. I ask unanimous consent that they be immediately referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration so that that committee may take action upon them, rather than to have them lie over a day on the calendar, as normally required.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 61. Resolution authorizing a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect (Rept. No. 35).

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to make a complete and comprehensive study and investigation of the antitrust laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable to—

(a) clarify existing statutory enactments, and eliminate any conflicts which may exist among the several statutes comprising such laws;

(b) rectify any misapplications and misinterpretations of such laws which may have developed in the administration thereof;

(c) supplement such statutes to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of such statutes; and

(d) improve the administration and enforcement of such statutes, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $250,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

S. Res. 62. Resolution to study juvenile delinquency in the United States.

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary under Senate Resolution 89 of the 83d Congress to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors, (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws, (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics, the Subcommittee To Study Juvenile Delinquency in the United States is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $154,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

S. Res. 63. Resolution providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary under Senate Resolution 245 of the Eighty-second Congress to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $58,500 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 64. Resolution extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations.

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary under Senate Resolution 326 of the Eighty-second Congress to conduct a thorough and complete study, survey, and investigation of the problems in certain Western European nations created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny, the Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Emigration of Refugees and Escapees is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $36,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

S. Res. 65. Resolution to authorize an investigation of national penitentiaries.

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to national penitentiaries, the Committee on the Judiciary, or the standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $13,600 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 66. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, insofar as they relate to the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending on January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistance, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $102,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 67. Resolution to authorize a study of the narcotics problem in the United States.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the narcotics problem in the United States, including ways and means of improving the Federal Criminal Code and other laws and enforcement procedures dealing with the possession, sale, and transportation of narcotics, marihuana, and similar drugs. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to (1) the extent, cause, and effect of unlawful uses of narcotics and marihuana in the United States, (2) the adequacy, administration, operation, and enforcement of existing laws relating thereto, and (3) the additions and changes which should be made in the laws and enforcement procedures to prevent illicit possession, sale, transportation, and use of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and to combat the increasing narcotic addiction in the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to procure such printing and binding, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1956.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 6. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1123. A bill to make unlawful certain commercial dealing in minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 1124. A bill to establish separate rates of excise tax on automotive glass; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1125. A bill for the relief of Stephen Fodo; and

S. 1126. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Antoniou Kostalas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1127 (by request). A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1128. A bill for the relief of Angel Castanedo Del Llano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1129. A bill for the relief of Isako Hardin (nee Shirayama); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 1130. A bill for the relief of Theresa Yik Mun Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFF:

S. 1131. A bill for the relief of Taufic Abdaliah Joudeh Khalaf; and

S. 1132. A bill for the relief of Rosario Troia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa):

S. 1133. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1134. A bill for the relief of Florence E. McConnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 1135. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes;

S. 1136. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1137. A bill to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army;

S. 1138. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended, providing certain construction and other authority; and

S. 1139. A bill to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1140. A bill for the relief of Heui Sik Min and his wife Mary Pu Keui Min and their children David Pyong Wha Min, Susan Pyong Soon Min, Sally Pyong Yun Min,

George Pyong Yu Min, William Pyong Soo Min, and daughter-in-law Gloria Yong Hiu Min; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1141. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie E. Taylor; to the Committee on Armed Service.

S. 1142. A bill for the relief of Arthur Sew Sang, Kee Yin Sew Wong, Sew Ing Lin, Sew Ing Quay, and Sew Ing You; and

S. 1143. A bill for the relief of Arthur K. Jefferson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1144. A bill for the relief of Carl O. Eck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1145. A bill for the relief of Thomas Marfoe (also known as Tao-Wen Ma); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1146. A bill to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives; and

S. 1147. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for Mr. BENDER):

S. 1148. A bill for the relief of Frank B. James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1149. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1150. A bill to include persons engaged in carrying out the provisions of labor laws of the United States within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to assaults and homicides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. IVES, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 1151. A bill to make the employment, and related practices, of any alien known by an employer to have entered the United States illegally within 3 years thereof unlawful, and for other purposes; and

S. 1152. A bill to provide for the seizure and forfeiture of any vessel or vehicle used in the transportation of any alien known by the owner thereof to have entered the United States illegally within 3 years thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1153. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1154. A bill for the relief of Hal A. Marchant; and

S. 1155. A bill for the relief of Iva Druzianich (Iva Druzianic); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1156. A bill to relieve States, subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, and certain educational institutions of liability to the United States for the value of certain aircraft acquired by them under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1157. A bill to terminate the withholding of Oregon State income tax from the wages of certain residents of the State of Washington who are employed by the Corps of Engineers at Bonneville Dam; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1158. A bill for the relief of Joseph S. Aldridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a United States Women's Armed Services Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," approved August 4, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, five bills relating to proposed legislation for the armed services. Each of these bills is requested by the Department of Defense and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the appropriate military department explaining the purpose of the bill. I ask that the letters of transmittal be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 1135. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes."

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1135 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 4, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its its objectives, and for other purposes," and a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This legislative proposal would amend the act of May 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 274), establishing a Civil Air Patrol. It would provide disability benefits for volunteer civilian members of the Civil Air Patrol, other than Civil Air Patrol cadets, who have incurred injuries or disabilities, including those resulting in death, while on active service in the performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Patrol, by extending to them the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

The benefits of the proposed bill are appropriately restricted. The term "performance of duty" for service rendered prior to the date of enactment of the proposal is specifically limited to active service, and travel to and from such service, rendered in performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol, under direction of the Office of Civilian Defense, the Department of the Army (War), including the Army Air Forces, or the Department of the Air Force.

For service rendered on or subsequent to the date of enactment of the proposed bill, the term "performance of duty" is specifically limited to active service, and travel to and from such service, rendered in performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol, under direction of the Department of the Air Force, and under written authorization by competent authority covering a specific assignment and prescribing a time limit for such assignment.

During World War II, members of the Civil Air Patrol, under the direction of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, performed invaluable services in the accomplishment of coastal patrol, liaison patrol, military courier service, and tow-target and tracking duties for antiaircraft-gunnery training. Civil Air Patrol operation during that period is illustrated by the fact that, incident to coastal patrol activities, nearly a quarter-million hours were flown; 363 survivors were reported; 91 vessels were reported in distress; and 173 submarines were located and reported. Apart from the payment of expenses for the use of privately owned aircraft and a small subsistence allowance, no emoluments were received by individuals for their services as active members of the Civil Air Patrol.

The proposed bill specifically provides that nothing contained therein shall be construed to confer military or veteran status upon any person.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress on January 5, 1953, as part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953. It was introduced in the House of Representatives as H. R. 2275 on January 29, 1953, and in the Senate as S. 2279 on July 2, 1953.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

This proposal would cause no increase in budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND THE ACT ENTITLED "AN ACT TO ESTABLISH CIVIL AIR PATROL AS A CIVILIAN AUXILIARY OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AND TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE TO EXTEND AID TO CIVIL AIR PATROL IN THE FULFILLMENT OF ITS OBJECTIVES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES"

Section 1 amends the act of May 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 274), establishing the Civil Air Patrol by adding thereto new sections 3 and 4, for the purpose of providing disability benefits for members of the Civil Air Patrol who have incurred injuries or disabilities, including those resulting in death, while on active service in the performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol.

Section 3 (a) would provide that members of the Civil Air Patrol, except Civil Air Patrol

cadets, shall, for the purpose of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, be deemed to be civilian employees of the United States.

Section 3 (b) would provide that in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act the monthly pay of such members, for the purpose of computing compensation for disability or death, shall be deemed to be $300, and that the term "performance of duty" shall mean only active service rendered in performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol.

Section 3 (c) would provide that the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee shall advise, if so requested, the Secretary of Labor concerning the facts with respect to claims filed with the Secretary of Labor.

Section 3 (d) makes the provisions of the new section 3 applicable as of May 20, 1941; however, no benefits would accrue or be payable in any case for any period prior to the date of this act, except medical or other expenses as authorized by sections 9 and 11 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. This subsection terminates the entitlement to benefits now being extended to members of the Civil Air Patrol and their dependents coincident with the enactment of this act.

Section 4 would specify that the act does not confer military or veteran status upon any person.

S. 1136. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1136 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to reproduce, rent, sell, or otherwise dispose of, to interested persons, concerns, and institutions, copies of the official records of the department concerned, including but not limited to, papers, miscellaneous documents, books, photographs, lantern slides, motion picture films, and sound reproductions, consistent with national security under regulations promulgated with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and at such prices and fees (not less than the estimated cost of furnishing copies of such reproductions) as may be prescribed under such regulations. The proceeds of such transactions would be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, and would not be withdrawn or reapplied except in consequence of a subsequent appropriation made by law.

The military departments of the Department of Defense accumulated during World War II a large number of technical and scientific documents, aerial and other photographs, motion pictures, sound reproductions, recordings, and other allied publications, many of which are of educational and historical value. A considerable number of requests have been received from private persons and concerns, and from educational and other institutions, for copies of such material.

It is believed to be in the public interest to permit the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to comply with such requests from sources whose requirements are legitimate when such compliance would be consistent with national security. Furthermore, the sale of such material would provide a basis for securing similar material and information in the possession of others.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

Authority similar to that requested herein was granted the Director of the United States Geological Survey by Public Law 206, 80th Congress. However, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments have not been authorized by the Congress to engage in the sale of such material, although the Departments of the Army and the Air Force have sold copies of still pictures and motion picture film pursuant to directions issued in 1918 by the Secretary of War. The Department of Defense sponsored a similar proposal in the 83d Congress (H. R. 2319). That bill passed the House of Representatives on May 19, 1953, with minor amendments but no further action was taken. The enclosed draft of bill is identical with H. R. 2319 as passed by the House of Representatives.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposal will cause no apparent increase in the budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

FEBRUARY 11, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Reference is made to a draft of legislation, "To authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes," submitted to the Congress on January 7, 1955 as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955.

In order to preclude the objection previously made by the Joint Committee on Printing, it is requested that the proposal be amended by the addition of a second section as follows:

"SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall alter, amend, repeal, or otherwise affect the provisions of any law relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications."

The contents of this letter have been coordinated in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and the Department of the Army has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it has no objection to the proposed section 2 for subject proposal as set forth above.

It is requested that the Congress consider the proposed legislation as amended by this letter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1137. A bill to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1137 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation would extend until June 30, 1957, the authority to enlist aliens in the Regular Army pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 30, 1950 (ch. 443, 64 Stat. 316), as amended (10 U. S. C. 631c). Under existing law, that authority will expire on June 30, 1955. The act of June 30, 1950, authorizes the acceptance of original enlistments or reenlistments, not to exceed 12,500 in number, in the Regular Army of qualified unmarried male aliens between the ages of 18 and 35. An original enlistment is for a period of not less than 5 years and aliens so enlisted must be integrated into established units with citizen soldiers. In addition, aliens enlisted or reenlisted under the act of June 30, 1950, as amended, who subsequently enter the United States, American Samoa, Swains Island, or the Canal Zone, pursuant to military orders, and who are honorably discharged after completing 5 years of service, if otherwise qualified for citizenship, are deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence within the meaning of section 329 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The extension of the authority to enlist qualified male aliens is desirable because it enables the Army to secure certain skilled personnel with special knowledge to fill positions for which citizen soldiers are not normally available. The Army has a continuing need for persons with extensive knowledge of foreign languages and local conditions. From both a planning and a tactical viewpoint, it would be of incalculable value when preparing for or carrying out a mission in a foreign country to have trained men familiar not only with the language of the area, but more important, with the customs of the people, their temperament and frame of mind, and geographical and other local conditions. Inasmuch as few native Americans possess such knowledge, the best available source of supply of such persons having these special qualifications are aliens who desire consideration for United States citizenship and who are willing to enlist in our Army for a period of 5 years or more in order to gain the opportunity to qualify for citizenship.

The proposed legislation would also permit the Army to enlist and utilize the services of alien specialists within technical fields, such as electronics. In addition, it would provide authority for the procurement of a small number of selected individuals of officer caliber with a long future potential to the Army.

While the Department of the Navy and the Air Force have indicated that they concur in the proposed legislation as it relates to the Department of the Army, they have no apparent need for such authority at this time and, accordingly, do not desire to be included within the provisions of the proposed legislation.

Although information relating to the number of aliens now serving in the Regular Army under the authority of this legislation and other aspects of the program is classified, the Department of Defense will, upon request, furnish additional information during closed congressional hearings on the proposed legislation.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposal will cause no apparent increase in the budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1138. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended, providing certain construction and other authority.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1138 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to its transmittal to the Congress for consideration. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this legislation be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would provide continuing statutory authority for the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to expand and maintain productive capacity in Government-owned and privately owned plants in order to meet current or mobilization military production requirements, with ownership remaining in the Government for those facilities placed in privately owned plants. The present authority for these purposes is contained in the act of July 17, 1953 (Public Law 130, 83d Cong.; 67 Stat. 177), as amended and extended (Public Law 523, 83d Cong.; 68 Stat. 531), which authority expires not later than July 1, 1955. This proposal would extend the duration of the effectiveness of its provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, or until such time as may be specified by concurrent resolution of the Congress, or until July 1, 1956, whichever is the earliest.

The present world situation is similar in many respects to that which led to the request of this Department for and the enactment of the act of July 17, 1953, in that it is still considered necessary that there be authority to meet requirements for rapid construction or expansion of production facilities needed to alleviate emergency production shortages which arise under conditions of urgent requirements for end items necessary for defense purposes. The act of July 17, 1953, itself was, to a large extent, a continuation of authority to expedite military production granted by statutes enacted shortly before and during World War II.

As was stated in connection with the request for enactment of the act of July 17, 1953, under normal peacetime conditions, the construction, conversion, or expansion of facilities for the procurement of military items is reduced to a minimum and limited to specific items which may be required during such peacetime periods. Peacetime authority of the military departments is not sufficiently broad to provide facilities that will be needed when an emergency occurs, nor is there any peacetime authority available to the departments for assisting the expansion of privately owned productive capacity for an emergency. Expansion of both Government-owned and privately owned plants became immediately necessary in the emergencies that occurred prior to World War II and with the advent of the Korean conflict.

In the case of construction at military installations, it has been the practice periodically to obtain specific authorizing legislation for known needs. This procedure is clearly not feasible in the case of construction or expansion of plants needed to alleviate unforeseen shortages in defense production. It is not possible to foresee and predict accurately the need for specific authorizing legislation. During World War II and the Korean conflict, authority similar to that contained in the act of July 17, 1953, proved to be of inestimable value for the rapid expansion of productive capacity by the construction of Government-owned and expansion of privately owned plants.

Under the existing international situation, the present emergency may become acute at any time without warning. In such an eventuality, time would be a large and very significant factor in the expansion of urgently needed productive capacity. It is believed that continued statutory authority for a rapid expansion of productive capacity is important to the timely satisfaction of the needs of the military departments for vital supplies. This proposal would continue not only the authority with respect to facilities required for current defense production but also to facilities intended for mobilization reserve purposes. The reserve capacity to be provided will be for essential military items requiring a long-lead production time. In the event of the full mobilization, a lack of adequate productive capacity for such items would create a serious bottleneck.

Authority to maintain production facilities on a standby basis at or near the location planned to be used for production purposes in the event of further emergency continues to be increasingly important as the immediate need for current production decreases. By arranging with contractors for storage and/or maintenance of production facilities at or near the plant site, and by leasing facilities in place to contractors in return for their undertakings to maintain and preserve the leased property or other production facilities as part or all of the consideration of the lease, the services can assure that such facilities will be available as quickly as possible for actual production in the event of a future emergency.

Continuation of the act of July 17, 1953, is considered to be extremely important to the Department of Defense in carrying out its responsibilities.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

This proposal would cause no apparent increase in budgetary requirements insofar as the Department of Defense is concerned.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1139. A bill to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1139 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of proposed legislation to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that the proposal is in accordance with the program of the President. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to obtain specific legislative authority for the continuance of the loan of the small aircraft carrier *Bois Belleau* (formerly the U. S. S. *Belleau Wood*) to the Government of France. Transfer of this vessel was effected under the act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), which authorized the President to loan a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France "until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in Indochina, as determined by the President, or 5 years after the date of this act, whichever is earlier."

Although no definite proclamation has been made by the President relative to the cessation of hostilities in Indochina for purposes of this act, various official statements have been made by the United States which recognize that the hostilities have in fact ceased. It is therefore considered desirable to obtain a clear-cut legislative authorization for the extension of this loan.

The Government of France has formally requested a continuance of this loan. The Department of the Navy is of the opinion that the loan is in the best interests of the United States. The proposal is drafted with the purpose of creating a new loan authority until June 30, 1958. If this authority is granted, the old loan agreement will be replaced by a loan agreement which more accurately reflects the needs and requirements of the present world situation. Inasmuch as the details of this proposal are, for security reasons, classified, this Department will furnish witnesses upon request who will be prepared to discuss further aspects of this proposal before the appropriate committees in executive session.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposed legislation would cause no apparent increase in budgetary requirements.

Sincerely yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

UNITED STATES WOMEN'S ARMED SERVICES ACADEMY

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a United States Women's Armed Services Academy, and for other purposes. I have prepared a statement in explanation of the joint resolution. In view of the fact that we are now proceeding under a time limitation, in connection with the morning hour, I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD, instead of being delivered by me at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) to provide for the establishment of a United States Women's Armed Services Academy, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. CHAVEZ is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

In connection with the joint resolution I have introduced, it would seem to be in order to say just a little about the background and the history of participation by American womanhood in the defense of our country and to give a résumé, also, of the

purposes and objectives sought to be accomplished by the proposed legislation.

On May 31, 1945, there were in the armed services a total of women, including nurses, of 266,184, of whom nurses numbered 67,507 and other categories totaled 198,677. Of the latter, 15,193 were officers, and 183,484 were enlisted personnel.

How did it happen that these large numbers of young women were wearing the honored uniforms of soldiers, sailors, and marines?

The answer lies in two factors. The first is the spontaneous patriotism of our womanhood. Women yield nothing to men in that direction. Always and always and always, American women have stood with their men in all things contributing to the welfare and security of our country. The recital of their offerings upon the altar of Americanism would comprehend all our history, from the hazards of pioneer days, with their Indian conflicts, down through the saga of the Revolution highlighted by the personal participation in battle by Molly Pitcher and Deborah Sampson, and thence through the ever-widening vistas of the industrial advances in more peaceful eras.

The second factor is opportunity. As technological progress has made its way not only in the peaceful pursuits of office and warehouse and factory, it has likewise had its impact in the fields of war.

Time once was when actual warfare involved combat which was localized and limited to men engaged in actual fighting, opposing forces within plain view and using weapons of comparatively short range and often under individual control. This made matters of service and supply routine and simple.

Today, we have scientific and total war, where even the fighting men may not see the enemy, where instruments of most intricate character and design are fabricated for purposes of wholesale destruction, and where the service and supply of the Armed Forces involve a host of undertakings, far removed from actual scenes of battle. Aside from, but directly contributing to the conduct of battle, are matters of intelligence, finance, accounting, transport, photography, mapping, and maintenance, to mention but a few of the activities that affect the actual conduct of war in the field. Women have already proven their competence and desire to make their contributions in these and many other fields. Some conception of the magnitude of the areas open to women may be had from the fact that in the Army alone, as of now, WAC officers are assigned to no less than 140 categories of officer positions. In other words, granted the opportunity for service, our women have proven eager to accept it.

Up to the outbreak of World War II, nursing and office typing marked the extent of the official possibilities for women to serve in war and defense. With the advent of total war and the enhancement of opportunities for service, the Navy, the Army, the Marines and the Air Force, in somewhat that order, set up training schools for officers in order to satisfy the critical demand for women capable of the leadership so sorely needed in wartime. A superb job was done, although at times the methods employed savored of improvisation.

In recognition of past contributions and future needs, in 1947 there was introduced a bill (S. 1641) to integrate women permanently into the armed services. In connection with the bill, which became law on June 12, 1948, the Senate received a report from the Committee on Armed Services in which are found the following significant statements:

"The hearings developed the fact that it is highly desirable that the experience gained in World War II in the utilization of women in the armed services be preserved and that their utilization be integrated in future planning by maintaining a relatively small nucleus capable of prompt expansion in time of emergency.

* * * * *

"In addition to the continued use of women in the positions which they filled so successfully during World War II, it is felt certain that further experience will show that their field of employment can be increased materially. Evidence presented to the committee showed quite clearly that the employment of women in the armed services was definitely on the increase when the war ended. Their performance of duty since the end of hostilities has continued at the same high level of efficiency that prevailed during the combat phase of the war. It is, therefore, considered entirely logical that they have a definite place in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments. * * *

* * * * *

"The joint resolution contemplates that, except where obviously inapplicable, the same personnel management policies that are prescribed for male personnel shall continue to govern the treatment of women in the armed services."

The time has now come to move forward by an additional step in line with the expression of policy last quoted. It is now fitting and appropriate that the opportunities for education and training afforded to selected young men in our several service academies be now extended in full measure to our young womanhood with the same purposes and objectives in view. In this way we shall grant full recognition to their contributions and shall broaden their opportunities for leadership in appropriate fields.

I visualize, indeed, the type of institution which will eventually emerge as one modeled along the line of our great universities where basic training will be afforded in the freshman and sophomore years in history, languages, general science, and similar subjects of value in all the services, with the junior and senior years devoted to majoring in special subjects appropriate to the branch of service chosen. Such an academy will then be in a position to grant degrees, so that those who may subsequently terminate their service may return to civil life with education and training on a par with that received by their colleagues and friends who have devoted themselves exclusively to civilian pursuits.

What was said on behalf of the Department of Defense in connection with the establishment of the Air Force Academy is pertinent here. Said the distinguished Assistant Secretary, Mr. Hannah:

"The Defense Department is a huge operation involving the expenditure of vast sums of money. When tens of billions are being spent to assure our survival, it is easy to become so involved in considerations of atomic versus standard weapons, guided missiles, radar screens, remote detection centers, carriers versus land bases, and on and on and forget that as we plan for the future there is no more important consideration than the wisest possible programs for training our future military leaders—Army, Navy, and Air.

"It is the view of some able and sincere educators that the educational needs of the services could be met adequately by institutions under civilian control. They point out that many of our finest military leaders have come from our civilian colleges and universities. They argue that graduates of civilian institutions bring into the services a highly desirable variety of background, training, and experience, and often a high degree of desirable specialization.

"I came to my present office in the Department of Defense with that point of view. I had studied the report of the Service Academy Board, previously referred to, and I remained convinced that undergraduate training of career officers could best be given in civilian colleges and universities, with the academies restricted to postgraduate training in various military specialties.

"My subsequent experiences in close association with large numbers of graduates of West Point and Annapolis and visits to the two academies have led me to a complete change of viewpoint. I am now strongly convinced of the wisdom of establishing an Air Force Academy, believing it to be necessary from the standpoint of national defense, and wholly desirable from an educational point of view.

"I have been led to this complete change of attitude by the personal observation that West Point and Annapolis perform two unique functions which no civilian institution of like rank could hope or be expected to do.

"I am impressed, first of all, with their intense and continued emphasis upon the ideal of service to the country. Nowhere else, so far as I know, are young men exposed to just that sort of influence over a protracted period. Loyalty and dedication to the service are hallmarks of the graduates of the military and naval academies, and we would be in a sorry state if the professional officers' corps did not have a high proportion of men who are motivated by just those ideals. Since such training is available nowhere else, it is not only desirable but necessary that the Air Force should have its own academy where it can teach its own cadets those same lessons.

"Second, I am impressed by the high standards of integrity and personal ethics enforced at the two service academies. No one would claim that their graduates are totally beyond reproach, but I do maintain that few professions, if any, can match the success of the service academies in inspiring their members to live up to such high standards of integrity and ethical conduct."

Every word in this quotation can be made equally applicable to the women in the armed services provided they are given the same opportunities.

An analysis of the joint resolution now offered will disclose that it provides for an institution to be known as the United States Women's Armed Services Academy, to be located at such place as the Secretary of Defense, with the advice of a commission to be established by him, shall select.

In order to establish the academy, provision is made for the acquisition of the necessary land, the preparatory and actual work of construction, permanent and temporary, and for the provision of necessary equipment.

The joint resolution then provides, generally, that all the appropriate legislation dealing with the United States Military Academy shall apply to this institution.

Finally, the joint resolution provides for appointments by Senators and Representatives.

It is a simple joint resolution, but one of immense possibilities. Its enactment will mean that we shall have brought ourselves up to date in the establishment of an officer group calculated to deal ably with the problems of modern warfare insofar as they are already recognized as within the sphere of capable women with the experience and training to do the job.

STUDY OF ISSUANCE OF URANIUM MINING STOCKS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, since the uranium idea came into being, individual companies of all kinds and by the thousands have started selling stock in

various uranium promotional ventures. I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution which would authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to make an investigation of that situation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. From my State, I have received many letters inquiring whether there is in existence a pamphlet on uranium. Does the resolution of the Senator from New Mexico provide for the publication of such a pamphlet?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I think that is most commendable, because that topic is a very live one. However, apparently there is no place where Members of Congress can obtain such information to be mailed to their constituents.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say that the different varieties of uranium stock being sold today through the mails exceed the total number of stocks listed on the Stock Exchange Board in New York City.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 59) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Whereas a large number of issues of uranium mining stocks are being offered for sale to the public through the mails and other instrumentalities of interstate commerce;

Whereas many of these stocks are being issued in relatively small amounts and have been exempted from registration under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended; and

Whereas such exemption from registration may, in many cases, leave prospective investors without adequate information concerning such issues: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the issuance of uranium mining stocks, for the purpose of ascertaining whether any changes are necessary in the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, or in the regulations promulgated thereunder, to provide adequate protection for prospective investors in such securities. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

STUDY OF NARCOTICS PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DANIEL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 60), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the narcotics problem in the United States, including ways and means of improving the Federal Criminal Code and other laws and enforcement procedures dealing with the possession, sale, and transportation of narcotics, marihuana, and similar drugs. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to (1) the extent, cause, and effect of unlawful uses of narcotics and marihuana in the United States, (2) the adequacy, administration, operation, and enforcement of existing laws relating thereto, and (3) the additions and changes which should be made in the laws and enforcement procedures to prevent illicit possession, sale, transportation, and use of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and to combat the increasing narcotic addiction in the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to procure such printing and binding, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1956.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INTEROCEANIC SHIP CANAL ACROSS THE ISTHMUS OF TEHUANTEPEC

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in the United States there is a considerable school of thought which believes that something should be done to further inter-American defense and Western Hemispheric economic progress and solidarity. Therefore, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution by which the President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Republic of Mexico, in order to carry out those purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 68) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That in the furtherance of Inter-American defense and Western Hemispheric economic progress and solidarity, the President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Mexico for the purpose of ascertaining the willingness of that Government to make a treaty providing for the construction, operation, and maintenance of an interoceanic ship canal across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO MAKE EXPENDITURES UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 172

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 69), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the time in which the Committee on the Judiciary may expend funds under the authority of Senate Resolution 172, agreed to January 27, 1954, is hereby extended through March 15, 1955.

CIVIL SERVICE WEEK—PROCLAMATION OF GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation issued by the Governor of Massachusetts, relating to Civil Service Week. A great number of Massachusetts citizens think it will be helpful to have the proclamation published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Federal employees have set high standards of accomplishment and integrity in meeting the responsibilities of public service; and

Whereas these high standards are made possible by a civil-service system based on merit; and

Whereas President Eisenhower recently issued an Executive order that establishes a new appointment system for the Federal Government, effective January 23, 1955; and

Whereas such Executive order provides greater job security for nearly 450,000 present Government employees, who get their jobs through competitive examination, and represents the greatest advance in many years toward providing the American people with a strong and stable career force to carry out the essential and complicated functions of modern government; and

Whereas each year, on the anniversary of the passage of the Civil Service Act of 1883, the Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor of Massachusetts sponsors special programs and activities to acquaint the public with the history and principles of the merit system in Government service.

Now, therefore, I, Christian A. Herter, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim January 16–22, 1955, as Civil Service Week and urge the citizens of Massachusetts to join with our Federal employees in a suitable observance of the 72d anniversary of the Civil Service Act.

Given at the executive chamber in Boston, this 26th day of January in the year of our Lord 1955; and of the independence of the United States of America, the 179th.

By His Excellency the Governor:

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc.,

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him in San Francisco, Calif., on February 18, 1955.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address delivered by him at the commissioning exercises of the 12th officer candidate class, United States Marine Corps, at Quantico, Va., on February 19, 1955.

Article entitled "Is Ike Popular Enough To Save the GOP?" published in the Democratic Digest of March 1955.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Statement prepared by him relating to the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

By Mr. DUFF:

Address delivered by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Representative to the United Nations, at a dinner of the Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 14, 1955.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to give notice, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that the subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold a hearing on the afternoon of February 24, at 2 o'clock, in the room of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The purpose of the hearing is to give an opportunity to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and his staff to appear before the subcommittee and make such report as they may desire, and to answer such questions as the members of the subcommittee may desire to propound, with respect to the program, policy, and accomplishments of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in carrying out its duties.

Attention should be called to the fact that on August 1, 1953, the Senate and the House adopted a concurrent resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Congress that all Indians in certain States and certain tribes should be released from the guardianship of the Government of the United States. Some action has been taken under that resolution. During the 83d Congress, certain bills on the subject—approximately 12 in number, I believe—were introduced. However, not all of them were passed.

From the mail being received by the committee, I know there is a great deal of interest in this matter; and I feel that this is the best way to draw the attention of all who may be interested to the fact that the Commissioner and his staff will appear and will discuss the entire problem of Indian affairs on the 24th of February, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to announce that tomorrow no other business will be transacted in the Senate except routine matters and the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question in regard to the proceedings today?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Will the acting majority leader give us assurance that there will not be a night session tonight? Some of us have made engagements for tonight which have been planned for a long time. I have been asked to make inquiry of the acting majority leader as to whether there will be a night session tonight.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am not in a position at this time, 12:05 p. m., to tell my friend from Oregon what the situation will be tonight. It is the hope of the acting majority leader that the Senate may dispose of as many of the measures it was announced last Friday would be considered today as it may be possible to act on. If it should be necessary that the Senate sit until a little later hour than usual in order to dispose of one or two important measures in the group announced on last Friday, it would be my intention to have the Senate remain in session long enough to dispose of them.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for the information.

ALASKA AND HAWAII STATEHOOD—HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 49, AND TELEGRAM FROM ALASKA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, today hearings on Senate bill 49, to enable Alaska and Hawaii to attain statehood, were opened by the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs. The Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, was the chief witness today; and I urge every Member of the Senate to read the Secretary's testimony.

In connection with these hearings, the Members of the Senate will be interested in a telegram I have received. It is signed by every member of the House of Representatives of the Alaskan Territorial Legislative, who are unequivocally supporting statehood. The members of the House of Representatives of Alaska are, of course, elected by popular vote of the citizens of the Territory, hence, their unanimous views can be said to express the position of the nearly 200,000 loyal and brave American citizens of the Territory of Alaska. Incidentally, Mr. President, the Alaska House consists of both Republican and Democratic members, showing again that the issue of statehood transcends politics both in Alaska and in our Nation as a whole.

I ask that the telegram from all the members of the Alaska House of Representatives appear at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNEAU, ALASKA, *February 17, 1955.*

Hon. JAMES MURRAY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We wholeheartedly endorse the efforts your committee is making toward achieving statehood for Alaska and we extend to you our sincere appreciation. May God be with you in your deliberations. We in Alaska stand ready to assume our responsibilities as a State. We feel our loyalty and devotion as citizens of the United States has been proven by performance and action. It is therefore with burning indignation that we observe from time to time the testimony that is tendered to your committee by the great leaders of the administration in Washington. We feel further that a careful analysis of the remarks made by Secretaries McKay and Wilson might well serve as a warning to the American people everywhere for it is clearly evident that their remarks show a complete and wanton disregard toward Alaskan rights as American citizens. Their testimony of late has dwelt upon the loyalty of Hawaiians, with specific omission of Alaskans. We protest such omissions. Their testimony refers to Alaska as a Federal area. From time to time there has been talk of using Alaska as a defense area. To your loyal citizens residing in Alaska this type of thinking is completely repugnant to America's heritage. We are an industrious and freedom-loving people. We intensely dislike being thought of as pawns in a game of chess to be played by high administrative officials. The Congress of the United States might well look further into the thinking and purposes of Secretaries Wilson and McKay. We feel their thinking is a serious matter and that disregard and abuse of Americans anywhere is a matter of concern to Americans everywhere.

E. G. Bailey, Lester Bronson, Seaborn J. Buckalew, Jr., Edith R. Bullock, Charles E. Fagerstrom, Hubert A. Gilbert, Richard J. Oreuel, Ken C. Johnson, Peter J. Kalamarides, Ed Locken, Stanley J. McCutcheon, Joseph A. McLean, George B. McNabb, Jr., Robert J. McNeally, Vernon M. Metcalfe, Harry B. Palmer, Raymond E. Plummer, Burke Riley, Irene E. Ryan, Thomas B. Stewart, Dora M. Sweeney, Warren A. Taylor, Russell K. Young, Wendell P. Kay, Speaker of the House; complete membership, Alaska House of Representatives.

INCREASES IN SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, THE JUDICIARY, AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from the Congress of Industrial Organizations, relating to salary increases for Members of Congress and Federal judges, together with a statement favoring such pay increases.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1955.

To: Members of the United States Congress.
From: Robert Oliver, assistant to the President and director of CIO legislative committee.

Enclosed herewith you will find a resolution concerning the pending legislation to increase congressional and judicial salaries which was adopted unanimously by the CIO executive board at its meeting in Washington, D. C. on February 2, 1955.

This action by the CIO executive board follows the endorsement of the recommendations of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries which CIO secretary-treasurer James B. Carey earlier forwarded to the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Judicial and Congressional Salaries.

The CIO realizes that there exists some misunderstanding of the merits of the pending legislation. We will make every effort throughout the country, both through our own membership as well as the general public, to show the rightness and justification of the proposed increases.

We urge you to proceed with the enactment of this legislation as rapidly as possible, confident that in the coming weeks a large segment of the population will be fully informed as to its complete justification.

CONGRESSIONAL AND JUDICIAL PAY RAISE

(Resolution adopted by the CIO executive board, February 2, 1955)

The CIO heartily approves the proposal to increase salaries of Members of Congress and Federal judges. We urge the leaders of both parties in both Houses of the Congress to unite behind the recommendations made last year by the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries to the end that they may be enacted into law as speedily as possible.

It has been 9 years since Congress and the Federal judiciary last received a salary increase. The result, during this period of high inflation and general salary increases for most segments of the economy, has been an increasing number of resignations of Members of Congress and judges to accept other more lucrative jobs in private industry.

The CIO believes that no body of men in the world have a greater responsibility than the Members of our great national legislature and the judges who are called upon to interpret legislative enactments. Such responsibility must be met with adequate recompense.

Not only have congressional salaries never caught up with inflation, but in recent years they have never been entirely commensurate with the high demands made upon Congressmen. Even the top recommendation for an increase currently being considered by the Congress will, if enacted, still leave the pay of Members of Congress far below the salaries being paid to executives of business corporations whose work has far less responsibility to the public interest.

Enactment of the pay increases for Congress and the Federal judges at the top levels recommended by the Commission on Judicial and Cnngressional Salaries will be an investment in good government that is long overdue. It should have the support of all citizens. We urge immediate passage of this legislation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from the American Federation of Labor dealing with Federal pay increase proposed legislation pending before the 84th Congress providing pay increases for Federal employees.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For the most part, the history of Government wage legislation is one of shabby treatment of Federal employees. Too often Congress and the executive branch of our Government have considered Federal salaries as a largess, rather than on the basis of the complex of competitive forces laid down by historic experience and the laws of economics.

Wages of a worker, including Federal employees, must be considered in the light of cost of living, productivity of the national economy, productivity of the individual firm and worker, collective bargaining, the American goal of a constantly rising standard of living and the demands of an economy predicated on mass production for a market through mass consumption.

During the greater part of the last two decades, postal and other Federal employees have been denied the ability to compete with increased prices. In a period during which our Nation as a whole enjoyed unprecedented national prosperity, Federal workers have been stepchildren of our American economy. For example, in only 2 years since 1939 have postal employees been paid wages above living costs. In 1952, salaries were a mere 4 percent above Bureau of Labor cost figures published by the Department of Labor; in 1953, there was a 1 percent spread between wages and living costs. Deficits were shown for the remaining years ranging from 1 percent in 1940 to 32 percent in 1948.

Inadequate wages for Government workers can lead only to an inferior caliber of personnel, expensive recruiting and training experience, decreased efficiency and, in the finals, poor Government operation. The combination of these undesirable conditions inevitably results in more costly Government to every taxpayer.

The cost of Government is properly the concern of each of us. No one advocates useless spending or the waste of our public Treasury. However, in the matter of wages for Federal employees, there is involved a very human question as well as a moral obligation on the part of those responsible for determining salaries. The human question can be satisfied only if the worker is given a wage that will enable him to provide decent and adequate care for his family. A moral responsibility exists as long as Federal employees do not have collective bargaining rights and in the absence of economic privileges accorded workers in private industry in a given wage dispute.

These two responsibilities should weigh heavily on those charged with establishing Federal salary schedules. They were completely ignored last year in the veto of the wage legislation approved by the 83d Congress. The current attitude of some persons in the executive branch of Government seems to be a take-it-or-leave-it offer, without reference to the needs of the employees or the justice of their case for better wages. This amounts to a callous disregard of more than 2 million Federal workers and their families and a complete evasion of the moral responsibility on the part of our Federal Government to pay fair and decent wages.

Bills now before Congress providing for a 10-percent wage increase have the support of an overwhelming majority of Federal employees. The executive council of the American Federation of Labor is convinced this is a minimum amount due Government personnel, the majority of whom have had no upward wage adjustment since 1951.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated February 17, 1955, which I received from Lawrence J. Walsh, dealing with the proposed 66.6 percent salary increases for Members of Congress and increases in the pay of certain other employees.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1955.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was stunned to hear of Congress supporting a 66.6-percent raise for Congressmen when GS employees, such as myself, have had no raise since 1951 and even a 5-percent raise vetoed.

It seems at least a 10-percent raise for GS employees should be expedited and made retroactive to the veto of 1954 or January 1, 1955, at the latest.

The fringe benefits make the take-home pay less when the cost-of-living expenses are greater.

An equitable raise is needed soon.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE J. WALSH.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from a person in Anthony, Tex., dealing with proposed salary increases for Members of Congress and the judiciary.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTHONY, TEX., *February 18, 1955.*

Senator WM. E. LANGER,
Patriot, Washington,
District of Confusion.

DEAR SENATOR: Congress votes itself $25,000 per year with perquisites. It is clear Congress feels that as the Republic is being destroyed anyhow its bones should be picked clean before casting them away.

It has been made clear by our modernized courts that an oath to uphold and defend our fabric of government has no power to bind the hands of officials reaching out to the synagogue of Satan, to be filled by those within the shadows who hold the money bags, as Aldrich held them at the stockyards at Chicago.

Every legislature should forthwith pass declarations of independence of the falling Government before the intended military dictatorship can be clamped upon them.

Dare you—even you—as boldly courageous as you undoubtedly are, dare put this message into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? It might make you President if you do. Is not an oath of office even less than a scrap of paper?

Of course wine and whisky comes high down there and many of those lads never before had a chance to spread themselves with someone else footing the bill. Anyway, Judas must have his 30 pieces of silver.

HUBERT H. HEATH.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced S. 1120, to enlarge and extend the special school milk program which was authorized in the Agricultural Act of 1954.

The provisions of the present act provide for use of $50 million of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation annually for 2 years, ending June 30, 1956, to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high school grade and under.

Under S. 1120, the amount authorized for such use would be increased to $100 million annually, and the program would be continued for an additional year, namely, until June 30, 1957.

On the basis of the program already undertaken, and the great advantages, from economic and health standpoints, of the increased use of milk, I believe that the investment of additional funds in this program will result in good to the entire country.

I also feel confident that many more schools will participate, and there will be more effective development of the program by all schools, if it is known that the plan will continue for at least 2 years beyond the present fiscal year.

This will enable the Department of Agriculture and the schools to plan their activities beyond the present more or less experimental program.

Every State, through its department of education, has a contract with the Department of Agriculture for the allocation of funds allotted to it.

Although the program was not initiated until September, an allocation of $35 million has already been made.

Funds allocated to the States, on the basis of a formula relating to the number of school children and the per capita income, are used to reimburse participating schools which show increased consumption of milk.

A base of normal consumption prior to the program is established in each school, and the school is then reimbursed at the rate of 4 cents per half pint of milk consumed by schoolchildren above that base.

Where no milk was previously served and a base is not available, the reimbursement is made at 3 cents a half pint for milk consumed by the children.

On February 15, 45,500 schools throughout the Nation participated in this program to increase the use of milk in the diets of our growing boys and girls.

Some States report their schools showing increased milk consumption of more than 100 percent.

While some States have already used all the funds available to them, others have not fully developed their programs.

It is planned, therefore, to make a reallocation of the unused funds for the fiscal year.

It seems to me that an effective program is being developed, and that it should be continued and expanded.

I have received from the Department of Agriculture some reports giving the status of the special school milk program on January 15.

I ask unanimous consent that the reports be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I think the information would be most informative to most Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM—STATUS OF PROGRAM AS OF JANUARY 15, 1955, AND ITS EFFECTS ON MILK CONSUMPTION IN PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

The special school milk program, which was announced to the States on September 10, 1954, is now operating in all States. This report summarizes the current status of the program from the standpoint of number of schools approved for participation and provides preliminary data on the effects of the program on milk consumption.

CURRENT STATUS OF THE PROGRAM

As of January 15, 1955, nearly 42,000 schools had been approved for participation in the program. This is an increase of approximately 10,000 schools above the number which had been approved as of November 30, 1954. The number of schools approved represents about one-fourth of the 160,000 schools in the Nation. (See table I.)

EFFECTS ON MILK CONSUMPTION

During the month of November the new program was operating in 44 States and the District of Columbia. Preliminary reports received cover operations in 19,535 schools in which 5.2 million children were drinking milk under the program. (See table II.)

In November, these schools achieved a 55-percent increase over normal base consumption of milk. For the 19,535 schools, this represented additional consumption of 32 million half pints of milk, or over 17 million additional pounds. Among the States reporting, the increase in milk consumption in participating schools ranged from 22 percent in the District of Columbia to 123 percent in Montana. Increases in the majority of States ranged between 40 and 90 percent. A few States fell below 40 percent but 7 States reported increases of over 100 percent.

TABLE I.—*Special school milk program—Status of program as of Jan. 15, 1955: Number of schools approved for participation compared to total number of schools in each State*

State	Number of schools approved for special milk program	Total number of schools in State [1]	Number of schools approved as percent of total	Number of schools participating in school lunch program [2]	State	Number of schools approved for special milk program	Total number of schools in State [1]	Number of schools approved as percent of total	Number of schools participating in school lunch program [2]
Alabama	948	3,872	24.5	1,425	Nevada	60	220	27.3	70
Arizona	267	591	45.2	283	New Hampshire	222	683	32.5	318
Arkansas	842	2,278	37.0	964	New Jersey	776	2,303	33.7	704
California	1,760	5,004	35.2	3,181	New Mexico	299	861	34.7	285
Colorado	390	1,693	23.0	579	New York	2,966	7,750	38.3	3,542
Connecticut	350	1,109	31.6	439	North Carolina	1,183	3,502	33.8	1,584
Delaware	81	240	33.8	92	North Dakota	254	3,277	7.8	793
District of Columbia	181	233	77.7	184	Ohio	1,398	4,875	28.7	1,859
Florida	486	1,873	25.9	914	Oklahoma	1,056	3,644	29.0	1,728
Georgia	1,211	3,376	35.9	1,421	Oregon	291	1,457	20.0	642
Idaho	198	750	26.4	406	Pennsylvania	2,431	8,638	28.1	1,489
Illinois	2,139	5,400	39.6	3,382	Rhode Island	178	490	36.3	115
Indiana	878	3,359	26.1	1,286	South Carolina	649	3,421	19.0	1,122
Iowa	970	7,257	13.4	1,017	South Dakota	217	3,775	5.7	301
Kansas	390	4,307	9.1	929	Tennessee	2,157	4,446	48.5	1,953
Kentucky	602	5,301	11.4	1,243	Texas	1,519	7,957	19.1	2,521
Louisiana	444	2,635	16.9	1,627	Utah	376	519	72.4	365
Maine	394	1,658	23.8	628	Vermont	310	938	33.0	425
Maryland	724	1,256	57.6	706	Virginia	744	3,273	22.7	1,316
Massachusetts	1,527	2,770	55.1	1,960	Washington	816	1,617	50.5	918
Michigan	2,010	5,153	39.0	2,302	West Virginia	786	4,157	18.9	1,505
Minnesota	1,267	5,645	22.4	1,253	Wisconsin	2,222	7,146	31.1	1,646
Mississippi	720	4,318	16.7	1,129	Wyoming	101	708	14.3	120
Missouri	1,636	7,500	21.8	2,264					
Montana	185	1,470	12.6	257	Total	41,922	161,497	26.0	55,677
Nebraska	311	6,792	4.6	487					

[1] Source: U. S. Office of Education. Latest data available is for 1951–52. Through consolidation there are currently a fewer number of schools, particularly in some States, than are reflected in the 1951–52 data.
[2] Peak number of schools by States—1953-54.

TABLE II. *Special school milk program—Preliminary report of school milk program operations by States for the month of November 1954*

State	Number of schools reporting	Children drinking milk	Normal monthly consumption	Total consumption	Increase above normal consumption	Percent increase	State	Number of schools reporting	Children drinking milk	Normal monthly consumption	Total consumption	Increase above normal consumption	Percent increase
			Thousand ½ pints	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*				*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*
Alabama	411	115,308	1,232	1,690	458	37	Idaho [2]						
Arizona	245	71,543	1,005	1,400	395	39	Illinois	1,295	653,158	4,785	6,851	2,066	43
Arkansas	292	76,019	845	1,577	732	86	Indiana	423	99,334	1,151	1,879	728	63
California [1]							Iowa	663	128,708	1,669	3,008	1,339	80
Colorado	287	44,726	532	886	354	66	Kansas	249	59,616	411	773	362	88
Connecticut [2]							Kentucky [1]						
Delaware	38	10,617	99	135	36	36	Louisiana [1]						
District of Columbia	131	36,982	541	660	119	22	Maine	215	24,327	230	323	93	40
Florida	144	40,381	530	799	269	51	Maryland	28	6,153	68	89	21	31
Georgia	122	30,256	451	679	228	51	Massachusetts	1,360	335,982	4,556	5,611	1,055	23

[1] No programs in operation during November.
[2] Programs in operation but State report for November not yet received.

TABLE II. *Special school milk program—Preliminary report of school milk program operations by States for the month of November 1954*—Continued

State	Number of schools reporting	Children drinking milk	Normal monthly consumption	Total consumption	Increase above normal consumption	Percent increase	State	Number of schools reporting	Children drinking milk	Normal monthly consumption	Total consumption	Increase above normal consumption	Percent increase
			Thousand ½ pints	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*				*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*
Michigan	1,306	385,048	4,015	5,616	1,601	40	Pennsylvania	844	134,272	1,214	2,450	1,236	102
Minnesota	717	166,293	2,399	4,313	1,914	80	Rhode Island	58	8,509	82	95	13	16
Mississippi	604	138,185	1,909	3,198	1,289	68	South Carolina	399	106,433	1,462	2,168	706	48
Missouri	1,186	171,117	2,138	4,140	2,002	94	South Dakota	136	17,072	205	436	231	113
Montana	70	11,394	102	227	125	123	Tennessee	1,528	281,619	4,101	6,802	2,701	66
Nebraska	234	40,835	559	870	311	56	Texas	780	222,687	2,114	3,259	1,145	54
Nevada	57	12,591	137	284	147	107	Utah	356	69,790	1,029	1,547	518	50
New Hampshire	103	12,942	192	241	49	26	Vermont	142	15,874	210	322	112	53
New Jersey	202	52,537	435	628	193	44	Virginia [1]						
New Mexico	125	35,576	243	488	245	101	Washington [2]						
New York	1,467	610,125	8,655	12,106	3,451	40	West Virginia	398	49,040	461	774	313	68
North Carolina	1,059	567,052	4,448	7,194	2,746	62	Wisconsin	331	57,131	670	1,435	765	114
North Dakota	146	18,768	264	463	199	75	Wyoming	57	9,364	94	193	99	105
Ohio	405	190,486	1,309	1,868	559	43							
Oklahoma	734	97,605	1,042	1,977	935	90	Total	19,535	5,191,017	58,107	90,135	32,028	55
Oregon	188	35,562	513	681	168	33							

[1] No programs in operation during November.

[2] Programs in operation but State report for November not yet received.

ADDRESSES BY FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER ON EUROPEAN GOOD-WILL TOUR

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, former President Hoover continues to serve his Nation with distinction and with lasting impress upon the course of world affairs. In November of last year, he made a good-will trip to West Germany, and during the course of his travels he delivered three major addresses, the contents of which reflect the depth of his understanding of today's difficult problems. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have these remarkable speeches printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME HOPES FOR PEACE

(Speech of Hon. Herbert Hoover before the press club of Bonn, Germany, November 24, 1954)

Mr. Chairman and guests, I am greatly touched by your tribute to my country and to myself. I also am told that I am the first speaker at a press club lunch in the new headquarters. I would not arrogate to myself the right to deliver any message from the press club of the United States, of which I have been a member for several years. Probably a public official is not expected to convey their messages, but, as a private member of the press club of Washington, I am glad to be the first speaker in this new room. Moreover, our press club has become a forum for the more important addresses outside of the halls of Congress. Every returning statesman who came to our country in recent years has addressed the press club to deliver their messages to the American people. So I hope you will grow and particularly will expand your diningroom. I might add that our own press club expanded four times since it was founded.

It appears to be the rule of the executive committee of our press club that the chairman should delicately convey to every speaker that 20 minutes would probably be as long as the press could dissociate itself from its work. So I warn you that I will not be more than 20 minutes.

It is indeed a great honor for me to be an invited guest of the Chancellor and the German people.

I have visited Germany many times over 40 years. My last visit was nearly 8 years ago. In the past 8 years since then, West Germany has risen from the ashes of war; the shackles of stifling and destructive economic policies have been stricken off; famine has been overcome; productivity has been reestablished. And finally sovereignty and full membership in the family of nations has been acknowledged as Germany's right.

I have rejoiced in each of these steps to the restoration of a great people. And these accomplishments are the vivid proof of the genius and vitality of the German people.

When I learned that you wished me to make some sort of an address, I inquired as to what subject within my province might be of interest to you. Your officials suggested that I appraise the hopes of peace as seen through some American eyes.

There never was a time when the Western World was more anxious for peace. All our peoples have had their fill of war. The daily prayer of all freemen is for a lasting peace.

In this 9½ years since the guns were silenced the disordered world with all its aftermaths has made some progress toward stability and peace. And from this progress there is hope.

You will remember the Biblical legend of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, the names of which were War, Death, Famine, and Pestilence. Fighting war and death have abated. Through aroused compassion, famine and pestilence were overcome at that time.

But out of these gigantic tumults has come another horseman to ravish the world with fear, hate, and a passion to destroy Western civilization. The ancient prophet was unacquainted with him, but his name is communism.

The tensions of military conflict with Russia seem to have abated in these recent months and from this abatement I believe we can have at least a gleam of hope. Moscow has made many declarations of peace-loving intent. They speak of peaceful coexistence.

It may be that they want more time to consolidate their gains. They may want more time to promote their infiltration of conspiracies in free nations. It may be that the growth of our deterrents against military aggression has influenced their minds.

It may be that internal forces are working within to restrain them. Every deep-seated social or political revolution has generated within itself a dynamism of military aggression or a crusading spirit to spread their new ideas. That was the case of the Mohammedan Revolution, the French Revolution, the American Revolution, as well as the Russian Revolution. Incidentally, in the American case, we had a vacant continent to invade, but we have been nonetheless crusaders to spread our concepts of freedom.

With time, the original leaders of these revolutions die off and some revolutions have the bad habit of devouring their young. At least their successors are less violent. They become more concerned with their dangers and improvements at home. From all this it may be that the Communist protestations are genuine. All of which possibly warrants a faint hope.

But from our many years' experience with the Communists, we should learn more about what peaceful coexistence means, and we must await works rather than words. The Western World has many times enumerated some of these works to which the Communists might contribute. They could join in the completely free unification of Germany; they could sign the peace with Austria. They could cease their germ warfare of conspiracies directed to overthrowing free governments.

With such steps, we might at least advance out of the thunder and lightning of this cold war into the dawn of a cold peace.

THE DEFENSE OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

But all this is too much to expect, and we should not be lulled into the abandonment of our means of defense. The only hope for our safety is the building up of arms and a united front among free nations which will deter Communist aggression against us. The Western World has no intention of military aggression against the Communists. The sole purpose of our alliances and our armament is to have such powerful deterrents as to convince them of the futility of starting war.

In this role of deterrents, the present proposed agreements looking to the arming of Germany and Europe have a very large part. Without the consummation of those agreements, the security of Western civilization in Europe becomes dependent on the malevolent will of the Communists.

NEUTRALISM

The coming of the fission bomb and guided missiles has contributed to the deterrents. But one of its discouraging effects has been that, for fear of its use upon them by the Communists, some nations engage in the futile hope to escape its ravages by neutrality in a great conflict.

Neutralism is no answer to the security of free nations in case of a major conflict. And moreover, it gives comfort only to the spirit of aggression from the Communists.

The only hope of at least relief from military aggression by the Communists is if each one of the powerful nations associates itself in the real building of arms for mutual defense. That is the most powerful of deterrents.

AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN THE DEFENSE OF EUROPE

Our American people have joined in the defense of Western Europe. It is an illusion of some European statesmen that we have joined and spent huge efforts for the selfish

purpose of defending ourselves. I and most of my countrymen have held that this is untrue. We can defend ourselves at much less cost in manpower and money, and build effective deterrents against Communist attack upon us. The fundamental reason for our participation is to preserve Western civilization in Europe and the freedom of nations in the world.

The strength of the West in effective defense is not a goal in itself but only a precondition and guaranty of freedom for unlimited development of our cultural and spiritual life.

Nor is there an atom of truth in the assertion that American action is animated by imperialistic ambitions. The world should know from our many actions in the past there is no imperialism in our blood.

Our people have met many discouragements and frustrations in these efforts. We have greatly reduced our resources with which we could increase the comfort and living of our own people. Europe must realize that many of my countrymen had lost confidence in these projects of European defense.

But the statesmanship of Chancellor Adenauer and your Parliament, through joining Germany in the effective defense of Europe, has done much to restore confidence and hope in the American people. We await similar action by other nations, but our patience is not inexhaustible.

THE UNITED NATIONS

At one time we built great hopes on the organization of the United Nations.

When that temple was built to guard the flame of peace, the world concerned itself with the architecture of the superstructure, but neglected its foundation. When Communists were taken into that structure, the foundation of its major purpose, which was to stop military aggression, was destroyed.

But it has some values as a forum whereby with electronic equipment we can denounce the ways of the Communists in five languages all at once. It does perform useful services in mediating minor conflicts, in public health, in some economic and philanthropic fields. It might also be a place where free nations can promote their unity. But the inability of the United Nations to prevent military aggression has given rise to defensive alliances intended for the protection of the free world.

THE RISE OF PEACEFUL NATIONALISM

One of the real foundations of peace is the rise of what is sometimes derisively called nationalism. There are those who with the organization of the United Nations had further dreams of some sort of world government where the independence of nations would be curtailed or abolished. They denounce nationalism as a sin against peace and progress and as a wicked force.

But the spirit of nationalism in its true sense springs from the deepest of human emotions. It springs from a thousand rills of inspiring national history, its heroes, its common language, its culture, and its national achievements. It rises from the yearning of men to be free of foreign domination, to govern themselves.

Nationalism rises from our national sacrifices. Every nation has laid its dead upon the altar of its country. These died with their national flag before their eyes and their national hymns upon their lips. National pride has swelled from their suffering and sacrifice. Within free nations these emotions, added to their religious faith, are their spiritual strength. It sustains their resolution to defend themselves against aggression and domination.

And equally do these emotions flow wide and deep in all free nations. Within them and their religious faith is their spiritual strength. It sustains their resolution to defend themselves against aggression and domination.

Nationalism does not mean isolation from unity of action among nations; rather does internal spiritual strength make common action for defense more secure and more potent.

And we can have some hope that slumbering nationalism in the Iron Curtain nations will awaken to throw off the Moscow yoke as it has in Yugoslavia.

I have rejoiced at the rise of a peaceful and constructive spirit in Germany. It has brought great steps in her independence and her strength. From her full freedom alone can come the common defense and her full contribution to all mankind.

THE UNIFICATION OF GERMANY

I can well claim that advocacy of German unification is no afterthought of mine for this occasion.

Twelve years ago, just after America entered the war, some of our leaders in a spirit of revenge and as a necessity of peace began to demand dismemberment of Germany. At that time I said:

"The Germans, like all virile races, are cohesive. The history of Europe's wars might be written around her dismemberments and the explosions from her movements to unity. * * *

"There can be no lasting peace * * * with a dismembered Germany.

"Nations cannot be held in chains. * * *

"No people can be punished and at the same time leave any hope of lasting peace. * * * Victory with vengeance is ultimate defeat in the modern world. * * *

"We can have peace or we can have revenge, but we cannot have both."

In my country we hold that unification must be the purpose of free nations; we hold that the work of unification must have their full cooperation; we hold that unification by the hand of Russia alone is not likely to be on terms which preserve Germany's association with Western civilization or which can assure the defense of Germany from Communist domination.

The German peoples have before now been the bastion of Western civilization which deterred its destruction by the Asiatic hordes.

My prayer is that Germany may be given the unity and full freedom which will restore her to that mission in the world.

CONCLUSION

I am not here to offer certain solutions to these dreadful aftermaths of war from which we still suffer, but to indicate the good will of my countrymen.

We must realize that in dealing with these gigantic problems the statesmen of free nations cannot perform miracles. But that they can, by vision, patience, tolerance, moderation, and understanding, abate the dangerous forces which breed aggression, fear, and hate, and they can increase good will among men; nor can we abandon the hope that some time the free nations who believe in God will mobilize in unity against Red atheism and human slavery.

In Germany the rebuilding of prosperity and independence from the demoralization of defeat has of necessity been by the patient laying of stone upon stone.

My countrymen believe that the reconstruction of West Germany, the revival of its economic life, and the respect it has won among nations is due to the great statesmanship of your Chancellor and to the great people he is privileged to lead.

THE SERVICE OF UNIVERSITIES TO FREEDOM

(Address by Herbert Hoover at Tuebingen University, November 25, 1954)

Mr. Rector, representatives of the faculty, and students of Tuebingen University, it is a great honor to come back to a university because, as some of you may know, 60 years of my life has been spent on the campus of a university. I have had interruptions due to the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse having followed me at times, but otherwise my life has been one of association with university faculties and students, and I have had the same refreshment of spirit that I have had today in meeting the students and professors.

You have conferred a great honor upon me by a degree from this, one of the oldest of the world's great universities, to one who is a graduate of perhaps one of the youngest of the universities. I have had, as I have said, many affections for universities but have only one honestly-earned degree to my credit. This event today constitutes my 81st great honor from universities by a degree. I might plead that perhaps life on the campus and some effort trying to find money to pay professors justifies the universities in awarding me some academic attention.

On this occasion, I could not fail to acknowledge the obligations which our much younger universities of America owe to their older German brothers. The structure of our faculties and our methods of instruction were established almost wholly on the pattern of German universities. You will realize that more than 25 percent of the races which have poured into the melting pot of America are of Germanic origin. The very names of many American leaders in every branch of our national life are witness to the value of this inheritance.

There is no better example of this fruitful interchange of intellectual life than the case of Friedrich List. His name especially comes to my mind because I have received the distinguished honor of being made an honorary citizen of Reutlingen, the city of his birth. List was indeed one of the great economists during the first half of the 19th century. As a member of your faculty, his pioneering ideas on economic freedom brought him trouble and exile. He naturally migrated to America where he took part in molding American life. Becoming an American citizen he was appointed American consul at Stuttgart. Over his remaining 20 years he was a frequent visitor to this university. Nor did he cease in his contributions to an understanding of the basis of the successful economic life of nations.

I have been in Germany many times, but one occasion was on a scholastic adventure. Some years before the First World War, together with Mrs. Hoover, we undertook to translate from the Latin the first comprehensive book published on my branch of the engineering profession. That was a work entitled, "De Re Metallica," by Georgius Agricola—being a huge folio of 600 pages with many intelligent illustrations. It was published almost 400 years ago. The author's real name was Georg Bauer, a doctor living among the mines of Saxony and Bohemia. He also held some public offices, among them Burgomeister of Chemnitz. Agricola had a tendril of memory with this university. Although he was a stanch Catholic, he was a lifelong friend of Melanchthon, a lecturer here, who aided in securing the publication of his book.

Previous translators had failed at any adequate translation because Agricola wrote in a language which had ceased to grow on the technical side a thousand years before his time. He therefore invented or adapted a maze of Latin terms for materials and technical processes unknown to the Romans. As a part of disentangling these puzzles, Mrs. Hoover and I visited the scene of his work. She also probed the literature in German libraries on these subjects which began to appear some years after Agricola. Ultimately with these aids, we disentangled some hundred of terms that he had added to the Latin language.

It might interest you to know that this book by a long-since-forgotten German scholar had some responsibilities for the

torrent of gold and silver with which the Spanish Conquistadors of Peru and Mexico flooded the world in the 15th and 16th centuries. It seems highly probable that the processes used in working the mines were taken from Agricola's book. No other text existed at that time, and the particular processes which they needed were not used in Spain. And as a further tribute to this scholar, he was the first to illuminate correctly the principles of many metallurgical processes which we still use today. However, we have improved the machinery.

I have been interested in your library and its ancient setting. Again I can establish a certain comity of action. I began during the First World War to make use of my many opportunities to collect what has become millions of items about this 40 years' tumult of wars, peace and revolutions. In this library at my university we have certain collections of German history of the First World War that were given to me by the Ebert regime which I do not believe are available in Germany. Again after the Second World War with the aid of our American officials and certain Nazis who wanted to be rid of their documents, we formed an extensive collection on the rise and fall of the Hitler regime, which might otherwise have been lost. Some of the First World War documents we agreed would not be disclosed for a term of years not yet expired. Sometime this library may be of use to your students of your own history.

An added burden has fallen upon our universities. The Communists, by infiltration, propaganda, and conspiracy are seeking to corrupt the truth, the morals, the religion and in fact to destroy the freedoms of Western civilization. They use our freedoms to destroy freedom itself, but they do not comprehend the spiritual, moral, and educational force which will defeat them.

I may be rightly accused of carrying coal to the Ruhr, but I might touch upon other of the immense mutual responsibilities of our universities in free nations.

Aside from the primary duty of instruction of the young, our universities have great mutual responsibilities in the generating of ideas bearing upon our great problems of scientific, social, and economic development.

One of the greatest contributions of the universities is to keep open the channels of free exchange of knowledge between all the universities in the world. It is one of the pillars of freedom today.

It is by the free shuttle of ideas between our universities that we weave the great tapestries of knowledge. Our academic traditions have developed a system that is peculiarly effective in spotting outstanding intellects and putting them to work in a climate that fosters creative, original thinking.

From the mutual building by our university faculties and laboratories devoted to abstract science have come most of the great discoveries of natural law. The application of these discoveries through invention and production has been the task of the engineers and technicians whom we train. Applied science dries up quickly unless we maintain the sources of discovery in pure science. From these dual activities of the scientists and the technicians, a great stream of blessings in health, comfort, and good living has flowed to all our peoples.

It may be that at one time scientific discovery and invention were the product of a poverty-driven genius in a garret. Even if that were so, it is no longer the case. The discovery of natural law does not come as a sudden concept. It comes mostly slowly—step by step—through the action and reaction among our university scientific faculties and their laboratories.

For instance, the parents of our radio communications of today were not the broadcasters. Its parents were Maxwell from one university, who by mathematics formulated the hypothesis of electrical wave motion. It was Hertz of another university who experimentally confirmed Maxwell's deductions and carried them further to the demonstration that these waves could traverse the atmosphere. Then university-trained technicians from a score of institutions gave the world mounting inventions which finally handed this great tool to the broadcasters.

We have another mutual duty. For it is our universities which must train the men for leadership in our professions and as executives of great economic institutions. It is they who must guide them away from incompetence and in their social responsibilities. It becomes the mutual obligation of our universities to inculcate in these future administrators morals, rectitude, and their responsibilities to the public.

But our universities have a still greater purpose. From them must come the expansion of the human spirit; with its over-widening penetration into the unknown; and, finally, as Huxley says, "the inculcation of veracity of thought."

But again I return to the fundamental of all—that is freedom itself. The discoveries of natural law can flourish only in an atmosphere of free minds and free spirits. And inventions and production flourish only in a climate of reward for effort.

And, finally, as a tribute to the influence of German universities, I may mention that my own university bears on its seal the words "Die Luft der Freiheit Weht."

It has been indeed the universities of the world which have molded and defended the freedoms of mankind. That has been your greatest mission over 400 years and it is our greatest mutual mission today.

Again, may I express my appreciation for the honor of this occasion.

Resistance to Communism

(Speech of Hon. Herbert Hoover before the Senate of the City of Berlin, November 26, 1954)

Mr. Mayor, I am grateful for your kind statement. I have been greatly honored to be a guest of a great people. It is only 8 years since I last visited Berlin, and today I have witnessed the great transformation of this city, both physically and in spirit, from that which I saw the last time. Outstanding in my eyes is that you have devoted your energies to the rebuilding of homes for the people rather than the repair of ancient monuments. And I have witnessed the tender care with which you attend the children and the refugees who seek sanctuary from the oppression which haunts you next door.

It is a great work, of which you may well be proud.

This city of Berlin is on the front line of the cold war. You are combat soldiers in that war. Should it, which God forbid, ever become a hot war, you would be the first to face the enemy. Thus you more than others have the right to feel a sense of relief that the tensions of imminent war have sensibly decreased during these recent months. We can only speculate upon the outcome of this change in Moscow's protestations.

Whatever the outcome we must remember that the Communists still confront us with three problems.

The first is their declared basis of immoral relations between nations. That must cause us to hesitate to accept their assurances of good will toward men without more particulars. St. James said: "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead."

The second of our problems is that ever since the war the Communists have held to increasing armament. And that even in the period when other nations had demobilized. That does not seem to spell simple defense measures. We have been compelled to resume arming to the teeth in order to deter any possible aggression from them.

The third is their militant promotion of the Communist faith. They incessantly seek by propaganda, infiltration, and conspiracy within all the free nations to destroy the very foundations of civilization.

For 6,000 years, since recorded time, every civilized race has believed in a Supreme Being. They have realized that the laws which control the orderly movement of the stars were not economic materialism. For the first time in this long corridor of human history, a group of men with the resources of a powerful nation and all the modern techniques of communication are seeking to inflict Red atheism on the whole world.

Let there be no mistake about it. Lenin repeated over and over again that "religion is the opiate of a people." And his malign announcements have been ratified before his tomb every year with fanatic zeal. And their agents at work every day in every free country provide ample confirmation of this wickedness. Their crusade would destroy men's belief in God. It would destroy the moral foundations of mankind. It rots the souls of men.

And the dreadful degenerations of 30 years of war have fertilized the soil of even free nations for the growth of these malign ideas.

Those dangers cannot be met by suppressing our own freedoms. Our Governments can take care of definite conspiracies to overthrow them by violence. But the organized infiltration of Communist ideas into disturbed and weak minds can be met only by moral and spiritual resistance.

The first bastion of that resistance is religious faith, whether it be Mohammedan, Jewish, or Christian.

Nothing is more true than George Washington's statement "National morality cannot exist in the absence of religious principle." And that strong bulwark of resistance to communism requires incessant strengthening of the moral foundations of all our people.

The Sermon on the Mount established the transcendent concept of compassion and good will among men.

There was profound confirmation of the validity of religious faith when compassion defeated the scourges of famine and pestilence which were inevitable after these two great world wars, even to the extent of furnishing help and relief to the Communists themselves.

A further stronghold of resistance is the unquenchable aspiration of the human heart for personal freedom and respect for the dignity of the individual man. The free nations hold that the right to this dignity and personal freedom comes from the Creator and not from governments—especially Communist governments.

But freedom does not come like manna from heaven; it must be cultivated from rock soil with infinite patience and great human toil. To assure the resistance of nations to communism, our governments must find solution of many social ills which prepare the soil for its evil growth.

I have faith that the yearning for freedom is not dead even behind the Iron Curtain, for their peoples have tasted the invigorating waters of free men in long centuries gone by.

I do not need to discuss the values of freedom with the people of Berlin. You live cheek by jowl on the boundary over which you daily witness the naked poverty, the inhuman toil, the terror, the repressions of mind and spirit which the Communists inflict upon your own compatriots.

INCREASING PRODUCTIVITY

One of the greatest resistances to communism has been the increase in productivity in the Western World. And among the many discouraging events in the world, it is a heartening encouragement.

Since the war there have been revolutionary strides in scientific discovery and invention.

These improvements have almost wholly come from the countries where men's minds

and spirits are free. It is only in those countries that men have the incentives to strive and where they might receive rewards for their efforts.

To these astonishing scientific discoveries and inventions Germany has contributed a full and perhaps even a greater share.

We of the free world have developed new materials in artificial fibers and plastics.

We have invented thousands of new labor-saving devices and better tools which relieve sweat from the backs of mankind.

We have by new designs immensely increased the power of our older aviation engines. We have invented the turbo jet and turbo engines. We have made huge advances in electronics. All of them have created an enormous expansion of transportation by air.

We have so improved the automobile as to bring it more nearly within reach of every family in the Western nations.

In agriculture, we have improved the quality of animals and plant life. We have improved the farmers' tools and his fertilizers.

We have enormously improved our fuel-produced electric power and its distribution. And now comes the possibility of the greatest source of power yet discovered by man. That is the fission of the atom.

In its benevolent aspects we are already building atomic powerplants, we are improving the health of men with its byproducts. And President Eisenhower has proposed the sharing of these benevolent uses by all nations, even including the Communists.

The discoveries in new drugs and antibiotics have brought relief from a multitude of diseases. They have lengthened the span of life and reduced pressures on our doctors and hospitals.

The sum of all this, and many other improvements, amounts to industrial revolution in only one decade of time.

Without this increase in productivity my country would have been unable to carry the burden of aid to other countries. And in Germany these improvements in productivity and the invigoration of private initiative under economic freedom have enabled you to carry the almost overwhelming burdens of the refugees and ruined industry.

Nor have you neglected the solution of stupendous social problems and the building of moral and spiritual bulwarks of resistance to Communist corruption.

With all this promise of increasing productivity, if the world could have peace, we would find a new Golden Age.

But meanwhile you, the leaders of Berlin, have a great responsibility toward the free world. And may I add the nations of Western Europe have a great responsibility toward you. You face an enemy who lives just across the street. You have seen your duty and have performed it well. Thanks to the spirit and courage of men under the leadership of two great mayors, you can, like the men of ancient Athens, hold your heads high and say: "I am a Berliner."

SENATOR MORSE, OF OREGON

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, to my regret, I was unable to be on the floor of the Senate when the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] announced that his colleague [Mr. MORSE] had registered in Oregon as a Democrat, and is now officially a member of the Democratic Party.

I am glad to have this opportunity to express my deep satisfaction at the decision of Senator MORSE to join the Democratic Party, and to welcome him heartily to the councils of my party.

I have had the opportunity of working very closely with the senior Senator from Oregon in many causes ever since I entered the Senate 6 years ago, even though for a long time we sat on opposite sides of the aisle. During that long period I learned to hold him in great admiration and respect. He undoubtedly is one of the greatest authorities on constitutional law, not only in the Senate, but in the entire country. He is a man of high courage and of sincere convictions, for which he is always ready to do battle, even though he knows that the causes he sponsors may be politically unpopular. I know of no man who has shown greater devotion to our country or who has fought more tenaciously and more vigorously for the peace and security of our Nation and, indeed, of the free world. I look on WAYNE MORSE as one of the most distinguished and useful Members of the Senate. I say this, not because of my long and close friendship with him and my personal affection and admiration for him. I say it with confidence because during the years I have had the privilege of standing side by side with him on many issues, I have learned to know his heart and his mind. He is a great American, and I am proud to be his associate in the Democratic Party and in the Senate of the United States.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 20, Calendar No. 29, authorizing the employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appropriating funds therefor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 20) authorizing the employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appropriating funds therefor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Daniel	Hill
Allott	Dirksen	Holland
Barkley	Douglas	Ives
Barrett	Duff	Jackson
Beall	Dworshak	Jenner
Bennett	Eastland	Johnson, Tex.
Bible	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Bricker	Ervin	Kefauver
Bridges	Frear	Kilgore
Bush	Fulbright	Knowland
Butler	George	Kuchel
Byrd	Goldwater	Langer
Case, N. J.	Gore	Lehman
Case, S. Dak.	Green	Magnuson
Chavez	Hayden	Malone
Clements	Hennings	Mansfield
Curtis	Hickenlooper	Martin, Iowa
Martin, Pa.	Neuberger	Scott
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Stennis
McNamara	Pastore	Thurmond
Millikin	Payne	Thye
Monroney	Purtell	Watkins
Morse	Robertson	Williams
Mundt	Russell	Young
Murray	Saltonstall	
Neely	Schoeppel	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the atomic energy tests in Nevada.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 20) authorizing the employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and appropriating funds therefor, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an additional amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was to strike out all after the word "Resolved" and insert:

That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration of the Government employees security program, and to report to the Senate not later than January 31, 1956, the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized until January 31, 1956, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be

paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 17, in the proposed amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, after the word "authorized", it is proposed to strike out the word "until", so as to make the resolution read:

That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration of the Government employees security program, and to report to the Senate not later than January 31, 1956, the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration to the amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is the Senate now considering Calendar No. 29, Senate Resolution No. 20?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the resolution, and also to be advised whether the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction of the subject which is intended to be investigated.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I certainly believe the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction over the subject. It pertains to Civil Service employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the resolution for the purpose of investigating security cases?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It affects civil service employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. What will the committee investigate with respect to civil service employees? Under the reorganization act, as I understand, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction over the Federal civil service generally. To me, that indicates jurisdiction over salaries and matters of that kind, including anything relating to the civil service. The investigation, as I understand, will relate to security risks in the State Department and other departments of the Government. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Louisiana is correct in part. At the same time, it will deal with civil service workers and their rights under the civil service laws of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. In what respect?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For instance, when a man is employed he has certain rights under the civil service laws.

Mr. ELLENDER. All the charges which have been made against any Federal employees who have been discharged, as I understand, have been based on matters pertaining to security and whether such employees were qualified from that standpoint.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We think the investigation will bring out the fact that many employees have been discharged because of things which are affected by the civil service laws.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what would the investigation relate, in particular? Can the Senator give us information on that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It may relate to whether an employee was discharged because of being late for work. It might also deal with an employee who probably drank too much at home, a fact which did not perhaps affect his work, but was entered on his record.

Mr. ELLENDER. Have any cases involving such questions come to the Senator's attention?

As I understand, what gives rise to this proposed investigation is certain action taken by the executive department in discharging a number of Government employees because of subversive activities. Is that what prompted the Senator to submit this resolution?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like the Senator from Louisiana and all other Senators to understand that I and the committee as a whole do not wish the Government to employ anyone who is connected in any way with communism. What the committee does object to, under our civil-service system of employment, is the discharge of employees on unsubstantiated charges, leaving their characters and names besmirched. We do not wish to have their characters besmirched in any way because of unfounded charges. We think that Executive Order 10450, as presently drawn, is so broad that it acts as a dragnet covering all employees. We do not believe that it treats the individual fairly merely to say, without adequate proof, that an employee is a security risk or is a Communist.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the committee's view that the executive department went too far in discharging workers for alleged security reasons, when, in fact, they were discharged for reasons other than security reasons?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We think that probably the investigation will bring out the facts.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know about that?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Many such cases have been brought to our attention.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it because of those cases that the committee submitted this resolution to the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it is not based entirely on a security question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No. We wish to ascertain what laws should be enacted to remedy the existing situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the committee originally requested a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That was the overall request. It was suggested by some of the members that the subjects be separated and that $125,000 be requested for this investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the Senator mean by separating the subjects?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Because the original request included holding hearings and investigating the question of what rate of postage should be charged on letters sent throughout the United States, whether it should be 3 cents or 4 cents and whether the second-class mail rate should be increased. That was all within one resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was any effort made to separate the two investigations?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That has been accomplished by an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that the request, as I understand, has been reduced by half?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the Senator is now asking for $125,000 to investigate certain discharges which have been made recently by the executive department under the so-called Government security program; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. We have been asked to investigate such matters.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that this resolution has been submitted by unanimous action of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from North Dakota is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not also true that one of the complaints is that an employee may be charged with certain things and be given no opportunity for a hearing?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the report which has come to the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not also true that in a great many instances the claim is made that civil-service employees have been discharged without any opportunity to face their accusers, in violation of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Many such reports have come to the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not the belief of the committee, from a preliminary investigation, that when an employee loses his job he is at least entitled to know what the charges are, and is entitled to face his accusers and listen to the testimony against him?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We think that is entirely correct, and we believe our committee is the one to see that the employee is given that right.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina further yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the committee any evidence that that has not been done?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Many persons have come before the committee complaining that they have not had a chance to ascertain why they were discharged from the service.

Mr. ELLENDER. The resolution provides for a period of approximately a year within which the committee may make its report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. A little less than a year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator assure the Senate that the money now being requested, if granted, will be sufficient to conduct the investigation and enable the committee to report back to the Senate, so that the matter can be closed within a year?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee and the staff made a study and came to the unanimous conclusion that it would be necessary to have the amount of money requested, and we think that amount will be sufficient.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator give us assurance that, with the money requested, the investigation can be made and a report submitted to the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can only promise the Senator from Louisiana that I shall do my best, and I am satisfied that the committee will do likewise.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that, like the old soldier, an investigating committee never dies.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee of which I was chairman for 4 years never requested any extensions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope that course will be followed in this instance.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the committee returned an unexpended balance to the Treasury. Is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 20) was agreed to.

CONTINUING AUTHORITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO INVESTIGATE WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 30, Senate Resolution 40.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 40) continuing the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to investigate employee welfare and pension plans and funds subject to collective bargaining.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, to strike out all after the word *"Resolved"* and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000 (inclusive of all sums heretofore authorized but unexpended pursuant to Senate Resolution 225, 83d Congress, agreed to April 28, 1954, as amended), shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution? I should like to ask a few questions with respect to it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is out of the Chamber at the present time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 30, Senate Resolution 40, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 31, Senate Resolution 41, authorizing additional expenditures and the employment of further temporary assistants by the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is advised that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who reported the amendment in the nature of a substitute to Senate Resolution 40, is present.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Then I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Louisiana address his inquiry to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. ELLENDER. What I wish to ascertain is the length of time the subcommittee has been investigating the subject matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to observe that the Senator from Alabama is now in the Chamber.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the subcommittee was created at the last session of Congress and began to function last June.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much was requested of the Senate?

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator refer to the original request?

Mr. ELLENDER. I refer to the original request.

Mr. HILL. One hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars was requested originally.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the committee has been at work since last June?

Mr. HILL. Yes, since last June. I am now a member of the subcommittee; I was not a member of the subcommittee during the last session. But the subcommittee has been very hard at work. If the Senator could realize the amount of work which has been done, I think he would feel that the investigation by the committee was more than justified.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume much work has been done, but what I wish to ascertain from the Senator is this: I notice that the amount requested is $150,000 plus a $40,000 carryover from the last session of Congress.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And also that it is intended to employ five persons as lawyers and investigators at the rate of $11,646 a year. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator state his question again, please?

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice from the report which was submitted in connection with the resolution that five persons will be employed as lawyers and investigators at the rate of $11,646 apiece. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HILL. Some of the employees, such as the actuarial and insurance consultants, are not employed on a full-time basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why, then, is the full amount carried as gross salaries? It is apparent from the report that it is expected that these employees will be engaged for the whole year.

Mr. HILL. It is necessary to make an allowance in the event they are used for the full period. The committee expects to make a study of union welfare funds, and it is necessary to employ actuarial specialists and insurance consultants, as well as lawyers and investigators. It is necessary to be prepared in order to go forward with the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. I observe from the report that the distinguished Senator from Alabama is asking for $150,000, which is $25,000 more than the committee received last year; and to that amount another $40,000 has been added. How will the additional $40,000 be used?

Mr. HILL. Last year the work of the committee did not begin until June. The amount now sought is intended to carry the committee through the present session of Congress. The likelihood now is that it may take the whole 12-month

period, the whole period of the present session, to complete the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. On page 2 of the report, the committee has indicated how $150,000 of the amount asked for will be spent. As I have just indicated, five persons will be employed. A chief counsel and staff director, an assistant chief counsel, a chief investigator, an actuarial specialist, and an insurance consultant, each at $11,646.

In addition, there will be administrative and clerical help, all of which, if added together, will necessitate an aggregate amount of $150,000.

How will the $40,000, which the Senator from Alabama is asking in addition to the $150,000, be spent?

Mr. HILL. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is chairman of the subcommittee, is on the floor. I shall ask him if he will answer the Senator's question. The Senator from Illinois, as chairman of the subcommittee, is more intimately associated with the work than is the Senator from Alabama, and has a more detailed knowledge of the activities of the subcommittee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The committee contemplates expenditures at approximately the same monthly rate as occurred during the start of the committee's work in the 83d Congress. The committee spent $100,000 in 8 months, or at the rate of $12,500 a month.

There was a demand from all quarters, including the present minority, the former majority, that the work of the committee should be continued. So what we are proposing is simply that we be permitted to continue to spend at the same rate for 12 months as was expended during the preceding 8 months; namely, $12,500 a month for 12 months, or a total of $150,000.

The $40,000, to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred, is the unexpended balance appropriated for the committee in the previous Congress, but which was not actually spent.

Mr. ELLENDER. The question I asked was, How will the $40,000 be spent? The Senator from Illinois has indicated that he expects to spend during this year at the same rate as was spent last year. It strikes me that $150,000 should be sufficient with which to do the job; instead, the Senator is asking for $190,000. Will the Senator not agree to $150,000?

Mr. President, if it is in order to do so, I move that on line 17 the amount "$190,000" be reduced to "$150,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$190,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I may say to my good friend from Louisiana that if he will consult the committee's budget, he will observe that salaries will absorb $130,000, leaving only $20,000 for traveling expenses, hearings, witness fees, and so forth.

Mr. ELLENDER. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars happens to be the amount asked for, and those items are all covered. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would not be willing to have the amount reduced to $150,000, and let it go at that. The committee would be getting $25,000 more than it received last year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but not at a greater monthly rate. I think the committee ought to have some leeway it had last year so as to provide for extraordinary emergencies which may develop.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator can make another request of the Senate if he finds that he needs additional funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a good deal of Scotch blood in my veins. I can assure the Senator that the committee will not expend money unnecessarily. I hope that we may be able to turn back to the Senate a large portion of the total sum requested. It is intended to turn back any unexpended balance, and we hope the unexpended balance will be large.

Mr. ELLENDER. The chairmen of the other subcommittees, in discussing their resolutions, have also expressed the same hope, namely, that they would not spend all their funds, but that they would have a large amount left over. But the point is that the actual breakdown of the committee's own budget shows a need for $150,000. Why not let the amount stand at $150,000? Why add $40,000 to the estimated expenditure needs? Why not save this $40,000? It is a small amount, but it is worth saving.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is my understanding that last year the committee was so economical that it saved $40,000. Certainly the Senate knows that there is not a Member who has strived more earnestly for economy than has the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. He has a record for trying to effect economies on the floor.

Although I speak from the opposite side of the aisle from the Senator from Illinois, I believe we can rely on the Senator from Illinois not to allow his committee to waste any money. The committee returned to the Treasury $40,000 last year. If they do not need the money, they will not spend it. Certainly the committee should not be limited in its attempts to secure adequate personnel. If they can locate a first class person at a little higher rate, they should not have to say, "We can pay only $9,000 or $8,500."

Speaking for myself, I hope the amount will not be reduced, and that the sum of $190,000 will be granted to the subcommittee, which is headed by a very worthy Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to thank the Senator from North Dakota. I shall try to be worthy of his trust in my economical tendencies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator from North Dakota that the committee's budget of $150,000, originally asked for, provides for the employment of 5 persons at the rate of $11,646. I am not questioning that request. All I am asking is that the amount be reduced to the figure submitted in the committee's budget, namely, $150,000—an appropriation which is $25,000 more than the same committee received last year.

Mr. LANGER. I read the budget very carefully. The Senator from Louisiana also knows, because he has been a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration for a long time, that the budget does not confine the employment of personnel to 5 or 6 persons. He knows that if more persons are needed, it may be necessary to employ 6 or 7, because the work of the committee covers the entire United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore.—The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution [S. Res. 40] was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOYMENT OF FURTHER TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 31, Senate Resolution 41.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 41) authorizing additional expenditures and the employment of further temporary assistants by the Committee on Government Operations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 1, line 1, to strike out all after the word "Resolved", and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

During the 83d Congress, when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] was chairman of this same subcommittee, I asked whether or not there was any duplication of the work done by the subcommittee, which is now headed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, and the work of the Internal Security Subcommittee, which was then headed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. In answer to my question the Senator from Indiana responded as follows, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 1, page 685:

> As I read the Reorganization Act, I think the Committee on Government Operations, of which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is chairman, has a proper field of investigation without going into the field of communism or subversive activities in the Government. That is the view which our subcommittee intends to take of the situation.

I should like to ask the Senator if he agrees with that statement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with it substantially. I might say that if the Committee on Government Operations, in the course of investigating in the field of efficiency and economy in Government, should discover that any department had been infiltrated by Communists, I think it would be its duty to investigate the infiltration and expose it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator of the opinion that that subject should be investigated by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, as I have said a good many times publicly, that at the time the Committee on Government Operations was created and its jurisdiction assigned by the rules of the Senate, possibly no one had in mind that the committee was being created for the purpose of investigating communism as such. The Internal Security Subcommittee has a much broader jurisdiction, of course, but I think that under the broad terms of the general rules, and having in mind the duties with which the Committee on Governmental Operations is charged, it would be its duty to investigate Communists in Government, if it developed there were any, during the course of an investigation which it was undertaking. However, I may say to the Senator that, since I happen also to be a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee, I have in mind having conferences relative to the work of the respective committees. I have already had one conference along that line, and conferences will be held continually, with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee. We shall undertake to see to it that there will be no duplication of work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because of the fact that the distinguished Senator serves on both the Internal Security Subcommittee and the Committee on Government Operations, he will be in a position to detect and avoid any duplication between the two Senate committees.

I express the hope that the chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, as well as the distinguished Senator to whom I am now speaking, will try to take the matter up with the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives with the view in mind of avoiding duplication of the work of that committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], Representative WALTER, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Government Operations Committee, have already had a conference with such objective in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has there been agreement among the chairmen of the three committees that duplication should be avoided?

Mr. McCLELLAN. There has been liaison established between all three committees, to the end that we shall undertake to avoid duplication. However, as I am sure the Senator from Louisiana knows, when an investigation starts, and it is anticipated that it will proceed in a certain direction, sometimes facts develop in the course of the investigation which make it necessary for the investigation to go a little beyond what was originally anticipated would be its scope. However, I again assure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that the chairmen of the three respective committees have already had a conference with the idea and the view of making certain that there will be as little duplication as possible.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, according to the report filed with the resolution, last year the committee spent $213,812.90. The Senator is now asking for $190,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the committee actually spent a little more than what the Senator has read, because certain amounts were used for personnel of the committee who were needed for its work. However, it is our purpose to perform the duties of the subcommittee as economically as possible. I regard the budget as a tight one, and the responsibility of the subcommittee to keep within it. It could very well develop that in the course of the labors of the subcommittee, it might have to come before the Senate and ask for more funds, but it is not my intention at this time to do so. The purpose is to do the best job the subcommittee can with the money for which it is asking.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since there has been a meeting of the chairmen of the three committees, I was hopeful that the subcommittee might be able to accomplish its purposes with an amount less than $190,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would depend on what kind of job the Senate desired done. Forgetting for the moment all about Communist infiltration, there is an unlimited field of work which should be covered and there are unlimited duties the subcommittee should perform. I have stated before, and I say again, that I could very well use another 4 or 5 members as investigators on the committee staff. There is a great deal of work such additional personnel could do. However, after all, there is no point in this subcommittee's going forth and developing raw material, so to speak, if the members of the committee do not have time to refine the raw material into a committee investigation and report. However, I think the committee will do its work, and that the members of the staff will be able to do the work assigned to the committee, within the limits of the amount requested.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Arkansas has about the same number of investigators at his disposal as his predecessor had last year, does he not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think there were probably 24 or 25 staff members at one time last year. I have in mind operating with 16, although the budget calls for 18. I intend to start with a staff of 16.

Mr. ELLENDER. What was the number on the staff last year?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not wish to exaggerate, but I think at one time the staff consisted of as many as 24 members. Of course, I am including clerical help.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand; and when the Senator from Arkansas mentions the staff of the present committee, he, of course, includes clerical help?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do include clerical help. That is the number on the staff we intend to start with. I hope that number will be adequate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 41) was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE REPORT ENTITLED "THE KOREAN WAR AND RELATED MATTERS"

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 32, Senate Resolution 56.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 56) to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of the report entitled "The Korean War and Related Matters."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 56, Calendar No. 32, be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELIMINATION OF NEED FOR RENEWAL OF OATHS OF OFFICE UPON CHANGE OF STATUS OF SENATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 34, Senate bill 913, eliminating the need for renewal of oaths of office in the case of Senate employees with changed status.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 913) to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 913) to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, in line 5, after the word "section", to strike out "1756" and insert "1757", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That no person who, upon appointment as an employee of the Senate, has subscribed or hereafter subscribes to the oath of office required by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, shall be required to renew such oath so long as the service of such person as an employee of the Senate is continuous.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF NETS IN ALASKA WATERS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar 35, Senate bill 456, relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 456) relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "set", insert "gill"; and in line 4, after the word "stake", insert "gill", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 3 of the act entitled "An act for the protection and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska," approved June 26, 1906, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 233), is hereby amended to read as follows: "It shall be unlawful to lay or set any seine or net of any kind within 100 yards of any other seine, net, or other fishing appliance which is being or which has been laid or set in any of the waters of Alaska, or to drive or to construct any trap or any other fixed fishing appliance, except a set gill net, stake gill net, or anchored gill net, within 600 yards laterally or within 100 yards endwise of any other trap or fixed fishing appliance."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE REPORT ENTITLED "THE KOREAN WAR AND RELATED MATTERS"

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar 32, Senate Resolution 56, to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of the report entitled "The Korean War and Related Matters."

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 56) to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of the report entitled "The Korean War and Related Matters."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is before the Senate. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 56) was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary 28,000 additional copies of the report entitled "The Korean War and Related Matters," prepared by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary during the 83d Congress.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PARTS OF HEARINGS ON INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the concurrent resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of certain parts of the hearings on interlocking subversion in Government departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 20,000 additional copies of parts 21, 22, 24, 25, and 26 of the hearings entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments," held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES OF UNITED STATES COURTS AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 26, S. 462.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 462) to increase the salaries of justices and judges of the United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 462) to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That (a) section 5 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the Chief Justice of the United States and to the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$35,000", and by striking out "$25,000" and substituting therefor "$34,500."

(b) Section 44 (d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to circuit judges, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and substituting therefor "$25,500."

(c) Section 135 of title 28, United States Code, relating to district judges, is amended by striking out "$15,000" and substituting therefor "$22,500", and by striking out "$15,500" and substituting therefor "$23,000."

(d) Section 173 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Claims, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and substituting therefor "$25,500."

(e) Section 213 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and substituting therefor "$25,500."

(f) Section 252 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Customs Court, is amended by striking out "$15,000" and substituting therefor "$22,500."

(g) The first paragraph of section 4 of the act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended, relating to the District Court for the District of Alaska, is amended by striking out "$15,000" and substituting therefor "$22,500."

(h) Section 7443 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to judges of the Tax Court of the United States, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Salary: Each judge shall receive salary at the rate of $22,500 per annum, to be paid in monthly installments."

(i) (1) Article 67 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, relating to judges of the Court of Military Appeals, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and substituting therefor "$25,500."

(2) Such article is further amended by adding at the end of subdivision (a) (1) thereof the following: "Each judge shall, upon his certificate, be paid by the Secretary of Defense all necessary traveling expenses, and also his reasonable maintenance expenses actually incurred, not exceeding $15 per day, while attending court or transacting official business at a place other than his official station. The official station of such judges for such purpose shall be the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 601 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $22,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $35,000 per annum."

(b) Section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (relative to expense allowances of Members of Congress), is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President) is amended by striking out "$30,000" and substituting therefor "$35,000."

SEC. 3. In addition to any amounts heretofore authorized by law for travel, each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, shall be allowed, under regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, respectively, out of the contingent fund of the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, the expenses incurred in making not to exceed five round trips per year, beginning at noon of January 3 of a calendar year and ending at noon on January 3 of the succeeding calendar year, between Washington, D. C., and the State, congressional district, Territory, or possession which he represents in Congress.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the 1st day of the month following the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. BUSH. What is the request now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is for the yeas and nays on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Granting the unanimous consent on that question will not block amendments to the bill will it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Is the request for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. At a later time I shall renew the request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. President, legislation to increase judicial and congressional salaries has been the subject of extensive hearings, thorough study, and deliberation over a period of years.

In addition to the other studies and hearings, I wish to call the attention of Senators to the hearings held before the Committee on the Judiciary, lasting 2 full days. Those hearings have been printed. Witnesses who might be opposed to the proposed legislation were invited to appear and testify at the hearings. No witnesses appeared in opposition to the measure.

Among the witnesses who testified before the Subcommittee on the Judiciary were the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; Mr. Bernard G. Segal, chairman of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries; Mr. Lloyd Wright, president of the American Bar Association; a number of judges and Members of Congress who had resigned from the bench and from Congress because of the inadequate salaries; and many other witnesses.

Included in the hearings were editorials from newspapers all over the United States, most of which support the conclusions of the Segal Commission.

On Wednesday, February 16, the House passed H. R. 3828, which is substantially the same as the Senate bill, S. 462, as regards salaries. There are, however, some differences between the two bills. In addition to judicial and congressional salary raises, which, except for the now existing expense allowance, are identical in the two versions, the House bill includes salary raises for United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, the Deputy Attorney General, and the Solicitor General; and section 4 of the House bill raises the ceiling with reference to professional and clerical staff members. That section further provides that the ceiling now in existence for legislative employees be amended to coincide with the highest grade established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

On the other hand, the Senate bill contains a provision not included in the House bill, in that it provides for five round trips a year for each Member of Congress between the District of Columbia and the State, district, or Territory which he represents, to be paid according to rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives. It is contemplated that the allowance for these trips shall be based on the actual expenses incurred, not on 20 cents a mile, which is the basis now used for the one trip a year. The provision for 20 cents a mile contemplated that on one trip the Member would bring his family to Washington.

With regard to the pay of Members of the House and Senators, the two bills differ in the respect that while the salary is the same the House version retains the now existing $2,500 expense allowance.

Now that I have touched upon the differences between the two bills, I should like to point out briefly the history of this proposed legislation. Congressional and judicial salary raises have been the subject of legislation for some time past. In the 83d Congress, 1st session, the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably to the Senate S. 1663, which was designed to increase the salaries of judges of the United States courts and Members of Congress, as well as United States attorneys and their assistants. The bill was introduced by the late Senator McCarran, of Nevada. Subsequent to the favorable report of that bill, the President's Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries was established by Public Law 220, 83d Congress. In July 1953 the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] introduced a bill which resulted in Public Law 220, 83d Congress. It was the duty of this Commission to hold hearings on the subject matter and report their findings to the Congress. By Public Law 220 the Commission was to be made up of outstanding members of agriculture, labor, and the business and professions, so that the members of the Commission were selected in equal numbers from the principal segments of the American economy. The President was to designate the Chairman, and of the 18 voting members 6 were to be appointed by the President, 6 by the Chief Justice of the United States, and 3 each by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In addition to this voting group, there were 9 nonvoting advisory members, 6 of whom were Members of the 82d or 83d Congresses, 3 each to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, and 3 judges of the courts of the United States, to be appointed by the Chief Justice.

Mr. President, this Commission was an outstanding, able, diligent, and conscientious body. The Senate Judiciary Committee hearings list, at page 48, the names, avocations, and connections of the various members of the Commission who were appointed by the President, the Chief Justice, the Speaker, and the Vice President, from business and professional groups, from labor, and from agriculture. It will be seen that the members came from all parts of the United States and represented an excellent cross section of our people and our economy. It will also be seen that the advisory members appointed by the Chief Justice, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House were distinguished Members of the Senate and the House, and leaders of American business, agriculture, and the professions.

The members of the Commission assembled in Washington. This Commission had no preconceived ideas regarding the question of salary raises, and went into the subject matter with an open mind.

The first thing they did, Mr. President, was to divide themselves into seven task forces, with members of labor, agriculture, and business of the Commission on each task force. Senators have on their desks the reports of the task forces of the various groups. There was a task force on comparative salaries in business. There was another task force on the standard of living evaluation. There was another task force on comparative salaries in the professions and in agriculture. There was another task force on comparative salaries in the field of labor. There was another task force on staff expense, office, and other services furnished by the Federal Government. There was another task force on salaries of the Federal judiciary.

These various task forces undertook to secure from different segments of the American economy information as to what persons in comparable positions were earning. The reports are fully documented. There are many comparisons in the very thorough reports. The conclusion of all the task forces was that district judges and Members of Congress should receive salaries of $27,500 a year.

The Commission held public hearings in Washington. I have here the hearings before the Commission which were held in Washington in the latter part of 1953 and in the early part of 1954. The Commission called before it almost 70 witnesses, whose testimony is contained in the volume I have here. The witnesses were leaders in their fields, and the record is very impressive. Nearly all the witnesses testified in favor of substantial salary increases for Members of the Congress and the judiciary. I think there were only three who testified against the proposal.

Mr. President, the Commission sent out some 10,000 letters of inquiry, not suggesting what the answers should be, but simply asking the opinions and advice of people all over the United States, including the heads of associations, men and women prominent in agriculture, business, and labor, and the editors of all the daily newspapers. The replies are contained in the appendix to the hearings of the joint commission. The letters received indicate that approximately 10 to 1 of the writers were in favor of increases for United States judges and Members of Congress. Of course, they did not all agree as to the amount of the increase, but it was upon all these data that the Commission made its findings.

The Commission recommended salary raises for the various categories under study, as follows:

The Chief Justice of the United States from $25,500 to $40,000.

The Associate Justices of the Supreme Court from $25,000 to $39,500.

Judges of the United States courts of appeal from $17,500 to $30,500.

Judges of the United States Court of Claims from $17,500 to $30,500.

Judges of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals from $17,500 to $30,500.

Judges of the Court of Military Appeals from $17,500 to $30,500.

Judges of the United States district courts from $15,000 to $27,500.

Chief judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia from $15,500 to $28,000.

Judges of the United States Customs Court from $15,000 to $27,500.

Judges of the Tax Court of the United States from $15,000 to $27,500.

Vice President of the United States from $30,000 to $40,000.

Speaker of the House of Representatives from $30,000 to $40,000.

Members of Congress from $15,000 to $27,500.

Mr. President, on page 3 of the report is a list of the recommendations of the Segal Commission, and they are unanimous recommendations. Some members of the Commission were in favor of salary raises higher than $27,500. Some few members felt that $25,000 might be an adequate figure, but the unanimous conclusion of these distinguished persons appointed by the President, the Chief Justice, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House was that district judges and Members of Congress should receive salaries of $27,500.

At this point I think it appropriate to pay a very high compliment to Mr. Bernard Segal, of Philadelphia, Chairman of the Commission, and to the other members of the President's Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries. The Commission did its work well and thoroughly. It conducted full hearings. Each member had an opportunity to express his own opinion. I think the Commission has rendered an important public service in trying to ascertain what would be adequate and proper salaries for the positions of which they were making a study.

Mr. Segal testified fully as to the work of his Commission. In hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on the Judiciary, he said he thought the salaries of Members of Congress should be $27,500. This also was the recommendation of the special Commission headed by the former President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover. The Hoover Commission recommended passage of legislation similar to that introduced in the last Congress by the late Senator McCarran, who was a former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Senator McCarran's bill was a little less than the recommendations of the report of the Segal Commission.

Furthermore, the American Bar Association, through its house of delegates, has on two occasions recommended enactment of the bill fixing the salaries as set forth in the Segal Commission report.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I sent telegrams to all the State bar associations, asking their advice about the matter. Most of the replies we received are included in the report of the hearings, beginning at page 295. Some replies were received after the hearings had been printed.

I believe that the State bar association of every State in the Nation has approved generally the salary recommendations of the Segal Commission, or at least has approved a recommendation that the judges should have adequate and substantially increased compensation.

It is my opinion that the conclusion of the Segal Commission was justified in the light of all the hearings. The original bill introduced by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], carried out the recommendations of the Segal Commission report. The Senator from West Virginia, as chairman of the committee, felt that he should present to the committee for its consideration the exact recommendations of the Segal Commission.

The bill as amended by the committee reduces the recommendations of the Segal report and the amount in the original bill by $5,000 all across the board.

On page 3 of the report of the Committee on the Judiciary will be found the Segal Commission's recommendations. In a parallel column will be found the amounts as set forth in S. 462, as amended. It will be seen that all the recommendations are reduced by $5,000. In my opinion, the salaries thus proposed represent the minimum amounts which should be fixed for judicial and congressional compensation.

The press of the Nation, as is evidenced by editorials included in the hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary, and by editorials published subsequent to the hearings, most of which have been printed and are now on the desks of Senators, substantially agree with the conclusions of the Segal Commission.

The Commission pointed out the increased responsibilities of Members of Congress, stating that Members now have to spend more time—indeed, full time—upon their business as Members of Congress; that their expenses are greater because it is necessary to do more entertaining and to see more of their constituents. The Commission also pointed out that problems at home are more acute, making it necessary for Members of Congress to return to their homes more frequently. The Commission further pointed out that it was in the public interest to provide salary increases for Members of Congress, stating that the Nation thereby would be better served.

It was also pointed out in the report of the Segal Commission and in the hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary that many capable Members of the Senate and the House and many excellent Federal judges have left either Congress or the judiciary because of the inadequate salaries now paid.

The Senate bill, which is now before us, recommends in each category referred to a reduction of $5,000 from the recommendations of the President's Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries. The Committee on the Judiciary was of the opinion that, under all the circumstances, the increase proposed by the bill was a fair, just, and reasonable increase, and should be accorded.

My own feeling is that a $25,000 salary would be fully justified; but there is naturally some hesitation about the amount of increase to be granted, when Members are placed in the unfortunate position of having to vote upon increasing their own salaries. The conclusion of the committee would seem to be fair, in view of the fact that the amounts proposed are substantially less than the figures recommended by an independent, unbiased commission, after extensive hearings on the subject.

So far as salaries are concerned, the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is closer to S. 540, introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], than to other companion bills. As a matter of fact, the bill offered by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from New Hampshire, S. 540, provided for a salary of $22,500 for both Federal district judges and Members of Congress.

A review of the history of judicial and congressional salaries is contained in Senate Report No. 25 on S. 462, which, I believe, is on the desk of every Senator.

That report is detailed and informative as to what has been the past history of congressional salaries and the salaries of judges.

It also points out the increased amount of taxes, the increased cost of living, and the devaluation of the dollar as compared with 1939.

At this point I should like to draw attention to the effect of the proposed increases. Let us take, for example, the salary of a circuit judge. On January 1, 1937, a circuit judge's salary was not taxable either by the Federal Government or a State government. The salary was $12,500 net to the judge. The 1946 act increased the salary to $17,500, but this salary was subject to a Federal income tax, and the same is true of the proposed increase to $25,500. The tax on this figure amounts to $6,534, leaving a balance of $18,966. The net gain to the judge over his 1937 salary of $12,500 is, therefore, $6,466. The cost of living, according to available figures, was indexed at 103.0 in 1937, and in 1954 the index figure had risen to 191.1. If the proposed increase is granted by Congress, the net to the judge, deducting the tax of $6,534 from $25,500, will be $18,966, leaving, as stated, a gain of $6,466 over his 1937 salary. This amount will be an aid in overcoming the increased cost of living, but will still leave the judge with a net spendable salary representing a lower purchasing power than his net spendable salary in 1937, for, in terms of 1939 dollars, the new salary will be only $9,862 net as compared with a former net of $12,500. This is due to the fact that in 1939, giving the value of a dollar to be $1, in 1954 that same dollar had a purchasing power of only 52 cents. For district judges a similar computation, in terms of 1939 dollars, would leave a new net spendable salary of $8,895 as compared with the 1937 spendable salary of $10,000. These same figures and computations run comparably through all of the proposed raises.

The figures will be found on page 6 of the report, and show what the increases will amount to in the case of the various judges who are provided for in the bill, in terms of the present value of the dollar.

In the case of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates, in 1939 the basic compensation was $10,000, with no additional expense allowance. The Federal income tax on that amount was $372, leaving a net salary of $9,628. By the act of August 2, 1946, the basic compensation was increased to $12,500, and by the enactment of June 13, 1945, Members of Congress received an expense allowance in the amount of $2,500, which was taxable. The act of August 2, 1946, made the expense allowance tax-free, but the act of October 20, 1951, again made the allowance taxable, and that is now the law. Therefore, the present compensation of $15,000, including the expense allowance, is subject to a Federal income tax. It is estimated that the tax for 1954 will be $2,148, leaving a net salary of $12,852. This, of course, does not include State taxes. Therefore, the present compensation of $15,000, with the additional tax deduction of $3,000 allowed for living expenses, will produce in 1954 a net salary of only $3,224 more than the net salary in 1939 of $9,628. Increasing the compensation to $22,500, as is recommended, will produce, after deduction of an estimated tax of $4,362, a net of $18,138, or a net gain of $8,510 over the net salary for 1939. As with the judges, if we consider the increase in the cost of living, it is apparent that for each Representative and Senator the purchasing power of this proposed compensation, after taxes, will be slightly less than his purchasing power, after taxes, in 1939. Using the 1939 dollar as worth $1, after taxes the Senator or Representative receives $9,628 as a spendable salary. In contrast, the 1954 dollar was worth 52 cents, so that, after taxes, and taking into account the cost-of-living index, the spendable salary of a Senator or Representative would be $9,432 on his proposed salary of $22,500.

For anyone who may be interested, these facts are set forth on pages 10 and 11 of the report. There is one mistake in the report. It reads that the purchasing power in 1939 would be "slightly higher." It should read "slightly less." So the salary increases proposed in the bill can be fully justified, and a little more than justified, on the basis of the increased cost of living and increased taxes; to say nothing of the fact that in 1939, and before that year, Congress was in session only a part of the year. The duties of Members of Congress were not so heavy as they are now. We have more responsibilities now. We have to spend more time on the job.

I am not going to burden the Senate further with figures in connection with the proposed raises, because the hearings and reports on this subject during the past few years are replete with information on that subject, but I do desire to point out, as the figures I have quoted indicate, that the net effect of these raises will be only to bring the salaries up to near a par with salaries existing in 1937 and 1939.

Some persons may think that such raises would constitute a windfall, but the fact of the matter is that they would only give back to Representatives, Senators, and judges a spendable salary comparable to what they had in years past. While wages and incomes in most categories have increased over the years and kept some semblance of balance with the increased cost of living and increased taxes, congressional and judicial salaries have not kept pace. I believe the figures I have referred to demonstrate that fact beyond any doubt.

As to the cost of this proposed legislation, the report of the President's Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries states that the cost, in terms of the national budget, would amount to only one-hundredth of 1 percent. That figure of one-hundredth of 1 percent was based on salaries of $27,500 for Members of Congress and Federal judges. The cost would be a great deal less than one-hundredth of 1 percent if the provisions of the bill now before the Senate were used for the computation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ERVIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Tennessee, but when he has completed his statement I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall complete my statement in a few moments.

On the basis of the statement I have just made as to the report of the President's Commission, the proposed legislation would cost less than the figure given, for the reason that in all categories there has been a reduction in the amounts recommended by the Commission. The actual cost of these raises to the United States, after taxes have been deducted, would be as follows: For the judiciary, $2,073,824; for congressional increases, $2,822,090; or a total amount of $4,895,914.

The Federal judiciary, like the Congress, is one of the major branches of the Government, and in many respects its actions more closely affect the daily lives of people than do the actions of either the executive or legislative branch. As Mr. Chief Justice Marshall observed:

> The judicial department comes home in its effects to every man's fireside; it passes on his property, his reputation, his life, his all.

Contact with the people by the Federal courts is a daily occurrence, and the regard in which the people hold courts form the bulwark of our American system of government. It is advisable and necessary to have on the bench judges of the highest caliber, and in order to accomplish this purpose they must be paid a salary which is fair, just, and reasonable under all of the circumstances. For the benefit of the citizens who appear before them, they must have some feeling of security, and they must be free from worries, other than those incident to the performance of their judicial duties. The hearings disclosed that on several occasions judges have resigned, not because they had a dislike for their work or position, but because of growing families and the failure to receive a salary sufficient to provide for their wives and children, in case of their demise.

One of those who resigned was a Judge Kennedy, who was an outstanding judge in New York. Recently I talked with another Federal judge in New York, who had made a fine judicial record, and he followed Judge Kennedy's course. Judge Kennedy testified that he left the Federal judiciary because he simply could not make enough money to provide for his family and security in the future. He testified that his income as a practicing lawyer was such that for the year after he resigned from the bench he paid $32,000 in income taxes. His tax alone amounted to more than twice as much as his salary as a United States district judge. It can readily be seen that while the United States Government should not necessarily pay rewards to judges on the bench, at the same time a reasonable living salary should be provided The committee believed, and I agree that such a reasonable salary is provided in the proposal now before the Senate.

A penurious policy which deprives our citizens of top-flight judicial personnel is shortsighted and dangerous. Responsible officers have forewarned us, "pay adequate salaries for quality or be content with less." Public service, for all its attraction, cannot command the services of the best talent if a necessary concomitant of service is financial insecurity.

The same arguments apply to the Congress. There is no business bigger than the business of government. Until modern times it was customary for the Congress to meet for only about 3 months in each session. That is no longer the case. Today adjournments are few and far between, and the session is practically continuous. It is apparent that the Congress of the United States, as a coordinate branch of our Government, is equally as important as the executive and the judicial branches. Obviously its membership is affected by those things which affect also the membership of the other two branches, such as the cost of living and the necessity for meeting their reasonable personal and family demands without fear or worry, so that the Members of Congress may apply themselves to the responsibilities of their office. The Senators and Representatives, like others in the Government, have families to support, and must also maintain themselves in reasonably dignified circumstances, both at home and in Washington, and at the same time be able to devote their energies and their time to their responsibilities.

The emoluments of office, so far as Members of the Congress are concerned, should be such as reasonably to approximate the compensation of those in similar situations in private life, though admittedly the analogy is a weak one because the responsibility of the Congress far outweighs in nature that of any private concern. The committee has been and is of the opinion that the raises in this category provide such a reasonable return to the Members of Congress. Again, let me hark back to the fact that, in essence, this proposed legislation would only bring Members of the House, Senators, and judges close to a parity in spendable salary with that which they received in 1939.

A student of the testimony given on this subject in the past few years must inevitably come to the conclusion that the pending proposals are amply justified, and while there have been individuals who oppose such legislation, for one reason or another, still there has not come to my attention any organized segment of our economy which has opposed the suggested raises.

I might also point out that for the past year or more newspaper editorial comment has been overwhelmingly in favor of these salary increases. I shall, at the conclusion of my remarks, submit a number of editorials for the RECORD.

As a closing remark I should like to call attention to the fact that this proposal has been unanimously supported by all segments of the American economy, and was specifically endorsed and recommended by the President of the United States in his state of the Union message to the 84th Congress.

I have tried to cover this subject generally, from all of its facets, in order to give the Senate a lucid picture of the effect of this bill and the need for it. I shall be happy, however, to try to answer any questions at this time that may be in the minds of my colleagues and which are as yet unanswered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield; or does the Senator from North Dakota wish me to yield the floor?

Mr. LANGER. No; I simply wish to ask some questions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then I am very glad to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. LANGER. I do not think the report shows that when the bill was before the committee, I voted against reporting it favorably.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure the records of the Judiciary Committee show that to be so.

Mr. LANGER. But the report does not show it, I believe.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct; the report does not show it.

Mr. LANGER. It is my understanding that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the ranking Republican Member, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], both voted in favor of reporting the bill favorably.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; that is my understanding. In fact, I know that is true. Of course, the votes in the Judiciary Committee are open for public inspection.

Mr. LANGER. As I recall, the vote was 11 to 1.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I believe there were not more than two votes against reporting the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Tennessee know of any State which today is suffering because the Federal judges are not excellent ones?

Mr. KEFAUVER. On the whole, I believe the States have excellent Federal Judges. I also know that many of the Federal judges are making a sacrifice by serving in that capacity. I know that the Attorney General testified that sometimes it was becoming more difficult to interest some of our better and more outstanding lawyers in accepting appointment to the Federal judiciary. But I do not know of any State which today is suffering because of the caliber of the Federal judges. However, I do not think that is any reason why they should not be paid fair compensation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let us consider the Senator's own State of Tennessee. My recollection is that when the last vacancy occurred in the Federal judiciary in Tennessee, there were a great many candidates of excellent character.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think that is true.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Tennessee know of any choicer plum for anyone who is a lawyer and who seeks appointment to the Federal service, than appointment as a Federal judge, at a lifetime salary of $15,000?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the case of one who seeks appointment to the Federal service, I think that appointment as a Federal judge makes an excellent position. Of course, there are always those who are ready and anxious to be judges. But even though there is a great deal of honor and even though there are many other benefits connected with such appointment, I still believe that such appointments should carry with them reasonable salaries.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Tennessee not believe that a mail carrier or a postal clerk or any other person connected with the Federal service requires just as much to eat and is faced with the same necessity to educate his children? So if there is to be a salary increase, should not the Federal workers receive a salary increase that will be proportionate to the salary increase in the case of the judiciary and the Members of Congress? In that connection, I refer to both the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I fully agree with the Senator from North Dakota. As a matter of fact, in the case of the Members of Congress or the judiciary, generally speaking a salary increase or a salary adjustment occurs approximately every 20 years, whereas in the case of other civil servants a salary increase occurs more frequently. As a matter of fact, the Federal employees generally have had, I believe, five salary increases since Senators and Representatives and judges were given a salary increase—which occurred last in 1946, as I recall.

If we consider the 1939 figures, we find that the salary increases for Federal employees generally have been proportionately greater than the salary increase for judges and Members of Congress.

However, I am not arguing that the Federal employees generally are not also entitled to a salary increase or to adequate compensation. In my opinion the Federal Government would be better and would be able to perform its work better if it provided reasonable and just compensation for all its employees. In fairness, such reasonable and just compensation should extend to postal clerks and to all other Federal employees, as well as to Members of Congress and judges.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the President of the United States recommended a 5 percent salary increase for Federal employees; and is it not also true that if the bill now before the Senate is enacted into law, the judiciary and the Members of Congress will receive a 66 percent increase in salary?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No, that is not entirely correct. Congressmen would receive 50 percent. However, the other Federal employees have had some salary increases in the past, although I am sure they are entitled to some further increase now. The other Federal employees have had five salary increases since the judiciary and the Members of Congress have had any salary increase.

Mr. LANGER. Let me call attention to the mail handlers. In 1939, they received a salary of $1,920. We ask veterans who are married and have one

child to live on that salary—although perhaps subsequently they receive a salary increase in the amount of $500. It is true that is quite a large percentage increase, as compared to the salaries that such employees have received. But today the average salary of the postal employees is between $3,200 and $3,500, with an occasional salary of $4,000.

Does not the Senator from Tennessee believe it to be rather discriminatory for us to raise the salaries of judges from $15,000 to $22,500, whereas, if we follow the recommendation of the President of the United States, we would be raising the salaries of Federal employees generally only 5 percent? Would it not be fair, if we are to raise the salaries of Government employees, to raise all Government employees' salaries alike—including those of judges, Members of Congress, and all other Federal employees? In short, should not all be increased in the same proportion?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it would be fair to do so, if our salaries were raised at the same time, too. But that has not been done in the past. For a long time the salary increases of the judiciary and the Members of Congress have lagged behind, as compared to the increases in the salaries of Federal employees generally. It is more difficult to obtain an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress and the judiciary than it is to obtain an increase in the salaries of Federal employees generally.

Let me say that although Federal employees are a loyal and hard-working group, the salary increases they have received have largely been behind the increase in the cost of living. So far as I am concerned, I wish to deal fairly with them.

On the other hand, I think the enactment of the pending measure would increase the salaries of Members of Congress in just about the same proportion or pecentage that the salaries of other Federal employees have already been increased.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, Mr. President; I am very happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Proposals for an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress and judges have been before the Congress at various times. I have always taken the position—and I wish to know whether the Senator from Tennessee agrees with me about it—that when a person becomes a candidate for election to Congress, either to the House of Representatives or to the Senate, he knows exactly what the salary will be. As of recent years, he has known the salary would be $15,000. If he did not wish to run for election to a job paying a $15,000 salary, no one forced him to run for election to it. Is it not true that if a Member of Congress is dissatisfied with the $15,000 salary, he can resign at any time he chooses to do so?

Does not the Senator from Tennessee believe that the pending measure should be amended, so as to provide that the proposed salary increases shall apply only to Senators and Representatives hereafter elected? Certainly, when I became a candidate for election to the office of United States Senator, other men and certain women in North Dakota might have been candidates for election to that office, if the salary had been $25,000; and I can envision a situation in which a man or a woman did not run for election to that office because he said, "I do not think the salary of $15,000 is sufficient."

So does not the Senator from Tennessee believe that the pending bill should be amended, so as to apply only to Senators and Representatives who may hereafter be elected to Congress? I may add that I believe the same should be true of judges.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No, Mr. President; I do not think the bill should be so amended, for if that were to be done there would never be a salary increase for Members of Congress, in view of the fact that only one-third of the Members of the Senate will come up for election next year, and an additional one-third 2 years thereafter, and the remaining one-third, 2 years thereafter. Thus, any salary increase would have to be put off for 6 years, if the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota were to be put into effect.

Furthermore, if that were to happen—under the philosophy of the Senator from North Dakota—the present salary of Members of Congress would be $1,500 a year, or perhaps $6 a day. Originally the salaries of Members of Congress were $6 a day. Later they were $5,000 a year.

In view of the increase in the cost of living and the increased financial requirements in connection with service in Congress, I think it is the duty of Members of Congress to vote for themselves a reasonable salary; and I do not think there is anything wrong with their doing so, particularly when a nonpartisan commission, most of the members of which were not appointed by anyone connected with Congress, has gone into all these arguments, and has made the recommendation that the salary increase be $5,000 more than the increase provided in the pending bill, as the Senator from North Dakota knows.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee mentioned the fact that the present President of the United States had recommended a salary of $25,000 for Senators or Representatives. Of course, the Senator from Tennessee is familiar with the fact that when Mr. Truman was President, he also recommended a $25,000 salary for Members of Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; President Truman did that. I do not know whether the present President recommended a specific amount. In his state of the Union message, he said he was in favor of the proposal; and I take it that he must have been speaking of the Segal Commission's proposal, although I do not believe the President stated a specific amount.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the distinguished Senator from Tennessee believe that at the present time the economic condition of the United States is not so high as some of the newspapers would have us believe?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I think the Nation's economy is in more danger than some of the optimistic newspapers would have us believe.

Mr. LANGER. For instance, I have been in touch with the head of the FHA in my State. He told me that the amount of indebtedness of the farmers of North Dakota is today greater than it was at any time during the height of the depression in the 1920's and 1930's.

Furthermore, only last week, I believe it was, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter showing that the farmers of North Dakota are receiving 6 cents a dozen for eggs. My recollection is that they never received less than that during the depression.

Some Senators disputed those figures; they said there must be something wrong with the figure 6 cents a dozen, and that it could not be correct. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will remember that I then placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD receipts I obtained from the Rutland Hatchery, at Rutland, N. Dak., showing that one farmer there sold 30 dozen eggs, and received $1.80 for the entire 30 dozen.

In view of the present economic situation of our country, does the Senator believe that an increase of 66.6 percent in congressional salaries is justified?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think that with adequate salaries we would have better government, and I believe the raise proposed in the bill is fully justified. The raise proposed in the bill aggregates about $4¾ million. When compared with the amount spent in the recent hydrogen bomb tests the other day, the cost is not large. Those bomb tests cost many times the amount involved here.

The annual cost of maintaining the Washington zoo—and I am in favor of the zoo—is I believe at least the amount of the increase proposed here. I believe we ought to pass a bill which is fair to everyone, and I think this is a fair bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell us how much a member of Parliament in England receives in salary?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should know, but I cannot answer that question at the moment. The Senator from North Dakota compared the proposed raises with raises given to civil-service employees. My best recollection is that in the task-force report there is a statement to the effect that since 1945 civil-service employees generally have had an 80-percent increase in salary. Since that time Members of Congress have had no raise, or, to put it another way, since the last time we had an increase in salary, the civil-service employees have received an 80-percent increase in their salaries.

Mr. LANGER. I am satisfied that those figures take into consideration promotions also.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; I believe those are percentage raises. That is my best information. However, you may be right and the actual raises would be around 50 percent.

Mr. LANGER. I believe my friend from Tennessee is mistaken about that. However, we will not argue the point. Even if the civil-service employees received an 80-percent increase, many of them were receiving starvation wages. Mail carriers, for example, were receiving as little as $1,950 a year. Therefore, even if they received an 80-percent increase they would still not be receiving sufficient wages to support properly a wife and a child or two.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe that many of the civil-service employees are entitled to increases at the present time. There is a bill before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is chairman, to provide for adequate compensation for civil-service employees.

Mr. LANGER. If I may be permitted to interrupt the Senator again, there is a bill before the committee which was introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to provide for a 5-percent increase. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and several other Senators, of whom I am one, are sponsoring a bill to provide for an increase of 10 percent. However, whatever the amount of the increase is, we have testimony from various postal organizations to the effect that even if we give them a 15-percent increase they will still not get as much take-home pay as they received in 1939, and that in order for them to be able to educate properly their children they should have an increase of 25 percent. That is the record that has been made in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I am a member.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am one of the sponsors of the 10-percent-increase bill, as the Senator knows. I am in favor of treating Federal employees fairly. I do not believe, either, that they should wait for fair compensation until the budget of the Post Office Department is in balance.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished colleague that Representative USHER BURDICK, of North Dakota, who has been strenuously opposed to any pay increases for Members of Congress, as the Senator from Tennessee knows, stated in his recent newsletter that he would be in favor of an increase of four or five thousand dollars. Does the Senator from Tennessee believe that would be an adequate increase?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; I do not believe so. As I recall, Representative BURDICK offered such an amendment on the floor of the House. I believe the least we can do is to bring our compensation up to the purchasing power, or somewhere near the purchasing power, it had in 1939.

The Senator knows that we must spend more time on our duties and that the burdens of our office are greater than in 1939, and that the responsibilities of Government are greater.

Certainly no one can argue that the 1939 compensation was too low. If we concede that that compensation was fair—and that is the year which is used in making computations for a great number of governmental purposes, and is generally conceded to be a normal year—then $22,500 seems to me to be a little less than fair now.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the Senator to yield once more, if he will.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Finally, I should like to thank the Senator for his courtesy. Perhaps the senior Senator from North Dakota is one of the poorest men in the Senate. However, I feel that I made a contract for $15,000 with the people of my State when I was nominated and elected to this office. Certainly when John Lewis' miners make a contract to work for so much an hour, we expect them to hold to their contract. If they come along after 6 months or so and ask for a raise—and such a thing has occurred in the past—we have almost unanimously felt that the miners entered into a contract for so much an hour, and that they should live up to it. Again I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the point of view of the senior Senator from North Dakota, and I respect his feelings. His position exactly reflects his feeling. I am sorry that I disagree somewhat with the position taken by the Senator. We usually view things pretty much in the same way. I wish to say also to the Senator from North Dakota that whatever amount is fixed as the compensation, whether it be less or more than now, I know he will continue his valuable and courageous service to the people of his State and to the people of our Nation.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope my friend the Senator from North Dakota will listen.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall put my statement in the form of a question and observation. The Senator from North Dakota brought up the question of the percentage of the increase which has been proposed. I have examined the pay scales on which Congress voted. In the Pay Act of 1945, for Federal employees, the increase was 15.9 percent. In 1946 there was an increase of 14.2 percent. In 1948 there was an increase of 11 percent. In 1949 we modified the Classification Act, which amounted to an incidental increase of 4.1 percent. Then in the Pay Act of 1951 there was an increase of 10 percent granted to Federal employees. The total increases amount roughly to 51 or 52 percent. Therefore we are not so far off after all, especially when we remember that increases in salary for Members of Congress come along about once in a blue moon.

Mr. LANGER. I am familiar with each one of the pay increases to which the Senator from Illinois has referred. I sponsored every one of them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. The bill making the largest increase was enacted when I was chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in 1945. At that time employees of the Post Office Department were working for starvation wages. We had the testimony of one mail carrier's wife that she could not even buy a pair of stockings. In addition, she had to wear a dress made from a discarded uniform of the mail carrier. The testimony showed these people were able to buy meat about once a month and that they did not have any butter at all, and had to rely on oleomargarine. At the same time the price of milk had gone up to the point where the children could not even get enough milk to drink. That was the sworn testimony before our committee. The situation was desperate, and that is why they got that large increase.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sensible of that fact. Certainly I am in favor of giving them an increase, and I hope that it will be reasonably substantial. That matter is now before my distinguished friend from North Dakota and his associates on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I trust that before too long the committee will have completed action on such a bill and will report it to the Senate for action.

Mr. LANGER. We plan to report it to the Senate tomorrow or on Wednesday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to make one other observation. I do not concede that our tenure is a contract. I do not concede that at all. The fact is that the Constitution is silent on the pay of Members of Congress. Madison, in the Federalist, I believe, stated that it is rather indecent to make Members of the House and of the Senate vote on their own pay increases.

However, since nothing was done in the Constitutional Convention along that line, we have no choice in the matter. It is certainly not a very pleasant task, because it is regarded as being somewhat self-serving. At the same time, if the Members of Congress do not do it, no one in heaven or on earth can do it for them.

Mr. LANGER. I can understand how the Senator from Illinois finds it hard to live on $15,000 a year, particularly when there are persons in the city of Chicago who make as much as $40,000, $50,000, and even $100,000 a year. I am sure if the Senator from Illinois were in private practice he would make that much money, because he is a man of great ability.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my friend very much.

Mr. LANGER. In rural areas an entirely different feeling is shown by our constituents. In States which do not have very large cities the people believe that $15,000 is a very large salary. I can show the Senate hundreds of letters I have received, not only from my own State, but from other States, where there are large rural areas, in which the writers suggest that $15,000 is an enormous salary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to allude to the Senator's question about the compensation that is paid to members of Parliament in England. The fact is that some members of Parliament have constituencies as small as 15,000 people, particularly in some of the poorer districts

of London. Those members of Parliament do not maintain any offices, they need no staff, and they have no mail problems. We see the difference in the situation when we compare such a member of Parliament with a Member of Congress who represents as many as 9 million people, as I do, in part, a Senator from the State of Illinois, or with a Member representing States which have even larger populations, such as the States of Pennsylvania, California, and New York. The office has become quite a responsibility.

The point I wish to make—and I believe it ought to be made constantly—is that we must think of the salary in connection with the office involved. The dignity of the office and its station must be measured against every other station in Government today. I may not be here, and the Senator from North Dakota may not be here, but certainly the situation and the position should be considered.

Mr. LANGER. I certainly hope the Senator from Illinois will be here.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my friend from North Dakota. The station itself merits a certain dignity. The other day I met a country lawyer from a little town of 6,000 population.. He said to me, "I have just a little country law practice, but I make three times as much out of my country law practice as a Senator is paid." I have no doubt about that.

When it comes to judges of courts, there must be some parity between the man who sits on the bench and resolves knotty and troublesome questions and the man before him who is presenting the argument. I think there has to be some decent and fair relationship.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first, I wish to compliment and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and his committee. I realize they have not been unanimous in their report, but I think they have been equally zealous in trying to bring forth a measure which is wholesome and fair. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has made a most able presentation of the committee bill. I personally feel that the committee bill is sound, fair, and reasonable, and I should like, without taking the floor myself, simply to comment on 2 or 3 points which, from my own observation, commend the bill for its fairness.

The first thing I should like to say is that since I have been in the Senate we have lost by retirement from the Florida delegation in the House of Representatives 4 able Representatives, 4 highly trained men of great ability and effectiveness. They were all younger men than is the senior Senator from Florida, and presumably had heavy family responsibilities. I know from personal discussions with three of them that the question of inadequate compensation entered into their retirement. I think it is a sad commentary upon the state of affairs in our Nation when able men who are well representing a progressive State find it necessary, because of inadequate compensation and because of their desire to take better care of their families, to return to private life.

Secondly, just a little while ago in my State we were trying to get an able lawyer to become a district judge, but he found, upon balancing the rate of pay against his private compensation, which was more than twice the amount he would receive, that he could not afford to make that sacrifice. It seems to me that it is a sad commentary upon the existing situation when we cannot make high judicial positions reasonably attractive to men of high professional ability.

The third comment I should like to make is that I especially commend the committee for its effort to balance up the situation. In the first place, district judges and Members of Congress have traditionally been regarded as in somewhat comparable positions, and the committee apparently felt it was wise to bring forward together district judges and Members of Congress.

The committee bill also tends to bring Members of Congress and district judges to somewhere near the position of the heads of the executive departments, that is, those who serve in the Cabinet; not entirely to the same position, because while the salaries of Cabinet members are $22,500, they are also furnished private cars, allowances for chauffeurs, and the like, which, of course, do not accrue to Members of Congress.

I think the bill represents a very able and a very successful effort to try to balance off the picture in Government, so that there will be some degree of financial attractiveness to qualified persons to serve in all three of the branches of Government, with some assurance that those serving in positions of high responsibility will receive sufficient compensation to enable them to carry reasonably their family responsibilities.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and I compliment him upon his efforts.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am certainly grateful to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida for his statement, and the members of the committee appreciate it very much.

While we are considering assistance, I wish especially to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for his aid in the efforts which have been made to secure fair treatment for Members and employees of the Congress, not only at the present time, but in years past. I had the pleasure of serving in the House with the Senator from Illinois at the time he was a member of the La Follette-Monroney committee for the Reorganization of the Congress. The Senator from Illinois was then a strong voice in the committee in the movement to bring about adequate compensation for Members of Congress and for the congressional employees. At that time the proposal under consideration was an increase from $10,000 to $12,000 with some allowance for expenses.

As I stated earlier, Mr. President, since it is a delicate matter for Members of Congress to vote upon their own salary increase, the Senator from Illinois, appreciating that fact, was responsible for the passage of a resolution which established the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries in the 83d Congress. That Commission did an admirable job.

The bill which is now before the Senate includes only those who were the subject matter of the findings of the Segal Commission. Others, of course, are entitled to consideration, and they will receive it at a later time. We have tried to limit this bill and have limited it only to those who were considered in the Segal Commission's report.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from the American Bar Association addressed to me, as well as letters from a number of other associations, together with resolutions and editorials, in connection with the pay-raise bill.

There being no objection, the letters and other matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 18, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Thank you for your letter of February 15 in response to my recent letter.

I understand that the congressional-judicial salary bill is scheduled for consideration in the Senate during the week of February 21.

On behalf of the hundreds of lawyers in all parts of the country, and of all political affiliations who have as a public service given unselfishly of their time in support of these salary increases, there are two matters which I think should be called to your attention at this time:

1. We believe that informed public opinion will support Congress in raising both congressional and judicial salaries by at least $10,000 per year. We enclose reprints from editorials which have appeared in recent weeks (most of them during February 1955) from newspapers in all sections, which editorials we believe substantiate the foregoing statement. These editorials are in addition to the 244 editorials which we filed with your subcommittee at the time of the January 25 hearing, and in addition to subsequent editorials which were enclosed with my recent letter.

2. We hope the Senate will concur with the House in including in this bill salary increases for United States attorneys and certain Department of Justice officials. Such salary increases were included in S. 1663 of the 83d Congress, as approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and have been recommended by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association. The fact that they were not included in the Senate bill which was before your subcommittee at the time of the hearing was due to the fact that this bill followed the recommendations of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, and that these United States attorneys and Department of Justice salaries were outside the jurisdiction of that Commission (see printed report of subcommittee hearings, p. 18). Whether the increases for these United States attorneys and Department of Justice salaries should be added to the pending bill on the Senate floor, or should be concurred in by the Senate conferees, is something which the Senate leaders can best determine, but we do feel that increases in these salaries is important in order to get lawyers with the

ability necessary to handle these important jobs.

I am sending a copy of this letter and enclosures to the other members of your subcommittee who were present at the January 25 hearing.

Sincerely,

MORRIS B. MITCHELL,
Chairman.

[From the Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal of January 31, 1955]

GRANGE SEEKS TAX RELIEF FOR FARMERS

(By Kenneth Scheibel)

WASHINGTON.—The leader of a national farm organization is hopeful Congress this year will grant tax relief to farmers on gasoline, oil, tires, and other automotive supplies.

National Grange Master Herschel Newsom announced this is one objective in the Grange's 1955 legislative program.

The Grange approves raising salaries of Members of Congress and Federal judges.

Newsom puts it this way:

"Members of Congress and Federal judges are the victims of inflation. It has cheapened materially the buying power of their dollar, making it difficult for them to make ends meet. Currently, it is also difficult to interest brilliant and capable men of moderate means to seek these positions.

"By raising congressional and judicial salaries, the public will benefit materially in the longtime run. For instance, a flat $10,000-per-year raise would amount to an annual additional cost of $6 million.

"This is the equivalent of an additional investment of $1 for each $10,000 spent by the Congress."

[From the Marshalltown (Iowa) Times Republican of January 18, 1955]

PAY HIKE FOR CONGRESS SOON?

Congress is more likely to give itself a pay increase this year now that the state of the Union message calls for a "substantial" one as "long overdue." The political hazard always inherent in voting for a pay hike for oneself might be overcome if a Member could get away with telling his constituents, "Who am I to oppose our President on something he insists is in the national interests?"

The present congressional salary of $15,000 (of which a tax-exempt $2,500 is for expenses) was set in 1946. Since then the dollar has depreciated in purchasing power by about 27 percent, and a rise in congressional pay to around $19,000 would be needed to make it equal to $15,000 in 1946 dollars.

However, much more than $19,000 is in the wind. In 1953 the Senate Judiciary Committee proposed $25,000, a proposal that ultimately was shelved in favor of a study on the subject by an outside commission.

This reported in January 1954 that the remuneration of Federal legislators (and judges) had failed to keep pace with the increased responsibilities and workloads of their offices, or with salaries in private business for comparable responsibility. The report, pointing out also that executive salaries had been adjusted upward since 1946 to meet higher living costs, suggested $27,500 for Congress.

However, few Members were prepared, just before facing the voters last November, to give themselves a salary boost of more than 80 percent or to come up against the cry that lawmaking for the people should not be entrusted to men who had voted themselves into plutocracy. So Congress contented itself in 1954 with expanding its pension benefits and its allowances for stationery, postage, long-distance calls, home-office upkeep, and clerk hire.

[From the New York Times of February 1, 1955]

UNDERPAID OFFICIALS

The amazing disparity between the salaries of Federal and New York judges has been referred to on this page in recent weeks; and we are glad to see Attorney General Brownell advert to it once again in urging an increase in the compensation of both United States judges and Congressmen.

Judges of the United States district court now receive $15,000, exactly half the salary in this area of judges of the somewhat comparable New York State Supreme Court. Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court receive $25,000, while judges of the highest New York tribunal, the court of appeals, are paid a total of $37,500 each. The point isn't that New York judges are overpaid, but that Federal judges are underpaid. The rise in the cost of living has, of course, had the effect of reducing their income even below the levels at which it had been set. It has been calculated that the purchasing power in 1939 dollars of a Federal district judge's salary after taxes amounts to less than $6,500.

Members of Congress receive a total of $15,000 a year. The commission that investigated these matters correctly observed a year ago that "Members of Congress and the judiciary have responsibilities as great as those of top executives in business or industry, or greater." Yet the top officials of 100 of America's largest corporations average over $100,000 a year in salary. No one is recommending anything like that for Congressmen, but surely the proposed $27,500 is reasonable compensation for so onerous a job. The difficulty in granting adequate pay to Congressmen comes from Congressmen who fear the political effects of giving themselves even an entirely justified increase. Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, with whom we do not often find ourselves in agreement, has urged on his fellow members an end to their timidity on this matter; and we think he is right.

Increased salaries obviously will not guarantee better judges or better Congressmen, but public freedom from economic pressures will prevent some good public servants from leaving their jobs for private life and will indicate to all of them that their Government is not really trying to get something out of them for nothing.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American of January 31, 1955]

TIMIDITY OF CONGRESS

We've contended that Members of Congress, and Federal judges as well, deserve an increase in pay.

Men of good caliber should not have to serve their country at financial sacrifice. Or, to put it more significantly, these important jobs should pay enough to attract men of great ability and not just the independently wealthy or broken-down hacks who want to get in out of the rain.

But the timidity of Congress. Its fear of the voters. These factors have prevented action in past Congresses. Now, as it seems probable a raise will be voted, they emerge in a ludicrous way.

It is reported that proposals will be made for a $10,000 pay hike (from the present $15,000 to $25,000) so that, on the floor, Members may humbly vote to reduce the increase and wind up with $22,500.

For goodness sake, men, the people aren't that dumb. They know Congressmen have to maintain two homes and contribute to everything from the smallest raffle to the party campaign chests.

They know Federal judges, at $15,000 make only a fraction of what they could command in private practices.

Please, gentlemen, just fix a fair figure. The people will understand and respect.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun Times of February 5, 1955]

CONGRESS SHOULDN'T TRIM ON PAY HIKES

If the salary scale for Federal judges and Members of Congress were based on individual merit or time spent on the job, some would deserve substantial pay cuts.

But a majority of the Members of Congress and of the Federal judiciary are conscientious, hard working—and underpaid. They shouldn't be penalized as a class for the derelictions of a few dunderheads and laggards who happen to be in their midst.

The arguments in favor of raising the pay of judges and Federal lawmakers are overwhelming. For one thing, higher compensation would be bound to attract candidates for Congress who are well qualified but who now hesitate to run because of the financial sacrifices that would be involved. While few lawyers would turn down an appointment to the Federal bench, it is nevertheless true that many have accepted the posts at a sacrifice far beyond the normal call of duty.

The average Senator and House Member must maintain two homes—one where he hails from and the other in Washington. Some get around this expensive problem by maintaining full-time residences in the Capital and part-time residences, sometimes in a hotel, at home. But even that, or a reverse of it, is not cheap. Moreover, the average Member of Congress is expected to keep in fairly close touch with his constituents and that entails considerable travel to and from the Capital—most of it being paid for out of the lawmaker's own pocket.

He is expected to dine—if not wine—his constituents when they visit him in Washington. Not infrequently, a visting constituent may ask him for a memento, such as a flag which had been flown briefly over the Capitol and which the constituent can boast about after he has returned home. These items are paid for by the lawmakers.

At present, Senators and House Members receive a total personal compensation of $15,000 a year. While many of them could live comfortably on that salary as private citizens at home, they as Members of Congress are unable to make ends meet. As a consequence, many Senators and House Members take to the lecture platform or write magazine articles to increase their incomes to meet family obligations.

Of course, some Members of Congress are men of private means and others have law practices which benefit as a result of their holding congressional office. But wealth or a law practice should not be a requisite for men or women seeking a seat in Congress.

The salary of a Member of Congress should be enough to enable him to live in dignity without going into debt, and to permit him to meet his obligations as a Federal lawmaker as well as private citizen.

Senate and House subcommittees have now approved congressional pay raises that vary between $7,500 and $10,000 a year. We believe that the higher figure, recommended by a special commission last year, is the one that should be adopted. The overall difference between the higher and the lower figure in the Federal budget would be infinitesimal. Congress should have the courage to do right by itself, regardless of what some disgruntled constituents or political opponents at home may say.

By the same token, the boosts in pay for Federal judges recommended by the same committees are generous, but not generous enough. The present recommendation is to raise United States district court judges from $15,000 a year to $22,500, instead of the $27,500 recommended by the special commission last year. Supreme Court Justices would be raised from $25,000 to $35,000, instead of the $39,500 urged by the commission.

As in the case of the congressional pay increases, we feel that the Nation would be better served if Congress were to approve the

higher rather than the lower figures for the Federal judiciary.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald of January 31, 1955]

ATTRITION OF TALENT

It is true, as some opponents of the proposed pay increase for Federal judges and Members of Congress have pointed out, that the Government cannot afford to pay its ablest public servants as much as they could earn in private employment. Public policy demands that there be a reasonable ceiling on official salaries. But it is equally true that the country is poorly served when salaries are so low as to drive many able men out of public life. That is what is happening today. Several of the witnesses before the Kefauver subcommittee told of leaving the bench or Congress because the economic pinch became too severe.

We think it is time for Congress to take a realistic view of this problem. It is clear enough that a great majority of Senators and Representatives think their pay should be increased. They have failed to act because of the unfortunate political inferences that future opponents may draw from the votes of present members to increase their own salaries. But this failure is causing a serious attrition of talent in public life. The Congressman who ignores this cost of standpat-ism may wake up to find that he is out of touch with public opinion. At least editorial opinion over the Nation has been found to be overwhelmingly in favor of more adequate judicial and legislative salaries.

The basic facts to be considered are these: The United States is a wealthy country. It can afford to pay its judges at least three-fourths as much as the judges of New York State are paid. It urgently needs the highest type of men on the bench and in its legislative halls. Consequently, it should not keep legislative and judicial salaries so low as to discourage men of special talent or to limit these positions to persons who are independently wealthy and do not need to live on their salaries.

Every time this issue has been carefully weighed from the viewpoint of the national interest recommendations for higher salaries have been forthcoming. Congress should have no hesitation, therefore, in following this advice. Now is the most favorable time in many years for enactment of a congressional-judicial pay bill. The next elections are nearly 2 years away. More important, responsibility for the measure can be evenly divided between the Republican President, who has spoken up pointedly for a pay increase, and the Democratic Congress.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Times of January 10, 1955]

PAY HIKE FOR CONGRESS

Now that President Eisenhower formally has called for pay increases for Congress, Federal district judges, and certain classifications of Federal employees, it is virtually certain that Congress will hike its own pay, probably as one of its first legislative steps in this session.

This seems especially certain since there are no national elections in the offing for nearly 2 years. Many Congressmen, quite willing to hike their own pay, have not been willing in the past to do so and then go home and stand for reelection. That attitude is a false one, for if the pay hikes are needed and deserved, they should be voted, and those who vote them should be willing to stand up before their constituents and state why they did so.

There have been several studies of congressional pay by impartial sources seeking to approach the matter objectively. Invariably the recommendation has been for an increase from the present $15,000 a year—plus certain perquisites which tend to ease some of the essential expenses of being a Member of the House or the Senate. Probably the hike voted will be to $22,500 a year, or perhaps $25,000.

But if Congress does increase its own pay, it had better make certain that it increases the pay of Federal district judges at the same time, and to a comparable figure. A pretty good case could be made that Federal district judges now—on the basis of general Government pay scales—are the most underpaid group in the Federal Government.

A big hike in congressional pay would gain greater public approval if some of the fringe benefits Congress has voted itself in recent years in place of a pay hike were eliminated, instead of maintaining the fringe benefits and establishing the pay hike, too. Fringe benefits in nearly all fields are simply an effort to increase income without actually attaching the increase to regular wage or salary income itself. They are meant, in other words, to be deceptive.

Congress should determine fairly and honestly what the pay of a Member of Congress should be in the light of the expenses involved—particularly the necessity of maintaining two homes in different cities—and then should set congressional pay at that figure and do away with the fringe benefits subterfuge.

[From the Albany (N. Y.) Times Union of January 31, 1955]

NEEDS CORRECTION

A situation that pending legislation in Congress would correct, and that badly needs correction, is that created by the inadequate pay of Federal judges.

Attorney General Brownell brought the matter to a head in his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, when he said the prevailing ceiling on salaries for members of the Federal judiciary presents an obstacle to getting men of maximum qualifications on the Federal bench.

The American Bar Association, at both national and local levels, has been saying the same thing for a long time, and since the members of the legal profession are in a position to give the facts about the matter it is time for Congress to listen.

The facts in substance amount to this: That the prevailing salary scale does not adequately compensate a man who has the experience, integrity, and prestige warranting his appointment to the Federal bench, and that if such a man accepts an appointment under these circumstances he has to do it at great personal sacrifice.

Mr. Brownell pinpointed this situation by pointing out that State and local judges in many parts of the country are paid substantially higher salaries than the maximum scale on the Federal bench.

Thus the completely illogical factor in the situation is that when a man has distinguished himself in State or local judiciary he can only step up professionally to a Federal judgeship at the cost of stepping down financially and economically.

It is unreasonable and unwise to ask the most eminent men of the legal profession to accept the vital responsibilities of the Federal judiciary with only the satisfaction of performing a patriotic service as their major compensation.

Many of our most eminent Federal judges actually do serve under these circumstances, but it is inherently wrong that the highest places of responsibility in the American judicial system should be more poorly compensated than inferior posts.

The dangers in this are obvious, as the spokesmen for the bar associations of the country have pointed out; and they are that appointments to the Federal bench may eventually be attractive only to men already rich in the legal profession or to men not notably successful in the profession.

The national interest in this vital field will be best served by making the emoluments of the Federal bench commensurate with the equality of the men on the bench most needed and desired.

[From the Iowa City Iowan of January 28, 1955]

PAY RAISES IN CONGRESS

Of all the melodies piped by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message, none could have come more sweetly to congressional ears than this:

"I also urge the Congress to approve a long overdue increase in the salaries of Members of Congress and of the Federal judiciary, and in my opinion this raise should be substantial, because I believe it should be to a level commensurate with their heavy responsibility."

This part of the Eisenhower program seems certain to enjoy full, bipartisan backing. Congressmen are touchy about voting themselves raises, but with this nod from Eisenhower, they will probably show no lack of eagerness in approving pay raises.

Actually, they deserve a raise, and a good one. Lawmakers in the House and Senate get a little over $15,000 a year, practically all of it taxable. That doesn't go far, what with their heavy expenses.

They have to maintain two residences, they have to entertain; they have to kick in on all sorts of political and community causes.

Obviously, Congressmen have to get other income. The New York Times found that 80 percent of the Representatives, and 67 percent of the Senators carry on a private business or investments. Some Congressmen add to their income—but detract from their legislative time—by writing articles or lecturing.

Last year, mainly because it was an election year, Congress turned down a pay raise for its Members. This year it should not be so skittish.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia, recently introduced a bill which would increase the salaries of the Justices and judges of the United States courts, and Members of Congress.

Under this bill, Members of Congress would receive $27,500, and the Chief Justice of the United States would receive $40,000.

Every reasonable voter, including the President himself, appreciates that the lawmakers have long deserved a healthy hike in pay.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) News of February 2, 1955]

CONGRESS TOO COY

Politicians have to love their jobs, or they could never stand the working conditions. For Members of Congress, one of the most deplorable of these conditions is poor pay.

The private citizen is apt to retort that if Congressmen are poorly paid, it is their own fault. But for any politician those elections come uncomfortably close together.

There is always this fear of voter reaction whenever congressional pay raises are mentioned. Yet, it is a poor constituency that would ask its representative to tackle his difficult and responsible job at half pay.

Most pay-raise advocates, including the President, believe Congressmen should receive about twice their present salary. A bill now pending before Congress would increase the annual figure of $12,500 to $25,000. The President also wants raises for judges and a number of other Federal employees.

Naturally, better pay attracts a higher caliber man to public office. Most voters know this. Perhaps Congressmen, themselves, need a little more faith in the fairmindedness of the people they represent.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune of January 24, 1955]

CONGRESSMEN'S SALARIES

Members of Congress will go a long way toward taking some of the sting out of voting higher pay for themselves, if they do, by adopting strict antinepotism rules at the same time.

The recent change in party control of committees of the House of Representatives brought to public attention the fact that the wife of the former chairman of the un-American Activities Committee has been holding an $8,500-a-year job. Mrs. Harold Velde has been official reporter for the Committee. Her husband, as Representative of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois received a salary of $15,000 a year.

There is no implication that Mrs. Velde was not qualified to fill the position. We assume that she was. It is also true that many other Members of Congress have found jobs for their wives or their children.

Some Members of Congress have defended such employment with the excuse that the expenses of the office are such that otherwise they could not live within the salary. There is increasingly wide public acceptance of the contention that congressional salaries should be raised. (A commission which studied the problem recommended $27,500 a year). We agree that salaries should be higher. But the lawmakers will find that there will be far less public criticism of a pay raise, if they make it clear at the same time that they are putting an end to the employment of wives at high salaries for such jobs as the one held by Mrs. Velde.

[From the Bayonne (N. J.) Times of February 8, 1955]

FEDERAL SALARIES

Federal Judge Modarelli's basic point before the Hudson County Press Club was a good one. It's a pity he had to argue it on the wrong grounds. Mr. Modarelli was insisting that the salaries of Members of Congress and of the Federal judiciary are too low, and in that he is right. The salaries should be raised and raised more generously than is provided for in bills now before Congress. But Judge Modarelli cited the amounts spent by the United States on foreign aid programs and the sums wasted, as he said, in the Nation's Military Establishment. From such material he argued that the raises for the legislators and the judges would be comparatively inexpensive.

The point that eluded Judge Modarelli—and it's odd the way trained barristers manage to miss important points—is that even if we had no foreign-aid program, and even if our Military Establishment were the very last word in efficiency, the Federal judiciary and the Members of Congress should be better paid. It has no bearing on the matter that we have spent much, some of it not well, on foreign aid and arms. Even if we hadn't, at present levels we still would be unwisely parsimonious in relation to some of our most important public servants.

Many capable citizens look upon Federal service, whether on the bench or in Congress, as a major sacrifice in public service. Such persons are overworked, and a great deal of the work lies outside their own special interests. In present circumstances we must ask prospective judges and prospective Members of Congress both to sacrifice their personal interests and make a money sacrifice too. It is more than we have a right to do. Like Judge Modarelli, we hope the present Congress meets the problem and meets it with the error rather on the generous than the niggardly side. And regardless of the Government's other activities, domestic and foreign.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of February 4, 1955]

CONGRESS NEEDS COURAGE TO RAISE ITS PAY SCALE

Congress will have to wait a long time before finding a more auspicious time than the present for raising the salaries of its Members and of Federal judges. A Republican President has recommended increases and Congress is Democratic, so the two parties will be equally responsible.

In addition, higher pay has been urged by a nonpartisan commission of citizens representing business, labor, and the professions. The next elections are nearly 2 years away. All in all, if the Representatives and Senators cannot get up enough courage this session to vote for a raise, they are likely to find even less favorable conditions in the future.

There is always some criticism when higher pay for Congressmen is mentioned. However, an increase is long overdue. The $15,000 a year which Senators and Representatives receive was a fairly high salary when it was first established years ago. Today it is not enough, considering the political risks to continuity of service and the public's need to attract men of the highest ability.

As to Federal judges, it has long been recognized that one bulwark of an incorruptible judiciary is adequate remuneration. While Federal judgeships have the attractiveness of life tenure and professional prestige, United States district judges get the same salary as Members of Congress. That is too little for the responsibilities involved, by present-day standards.

[From the Erie (Pa.) Times of February 2, 1955]

PAY BOOST FOR CONGRESSMEN

Congressmen are expected to raise their pay next year from $15,000 a year to $25,000 according to a dispatch from Washington which says the leaders of both parties are in favor of the idea.

In our opinion it is a good idea if only because its adoption will just about force Congress to do as much for the Federal judiciary who are now very badly underpaid.

Members were timid about voting themselves a raise on the eve of elections in 1954.

There is a fine irony in the situation. Congressmen can't get along on their salaries because inflation has raised the cost of living. And who was responsible for inflation? Nobody but the Members of Congress who forgot how to balance the budget and stay out of expensive wars.

Congressmen who will cut five or ten billion dollars from the estimates that will be sent to Congress in a few weeks will be worth $25,000 a head. It would be wonderful if the raise could be made contingent upon the saving.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Sun-Telegraph of February 3, 1955]

OH, TIMIDITY

We've contended that Members of Congress, and certainly our Federal judges as well, deserve an increase in pay.

Our belief is that men of good caliber should not have to serve their country at financial sacrifice. Or, to put it more significantly, these important jobs should pay enough so that they are attractive to men of high ability and not just to the independently wealthy or broken-down hacks who want to get in out of the rain.

Oh, the timidity of Congress. The fear of the voters.

These factors have prevented action in past Congresses. Now, as it seems probable a raise will be voted, they emerge in a ludicrous way.

It is reported that proposals will be made for a $10,000 pay hike (from the present $15,000 to $25,000) so that, on the floor, Members may humbly vote to reduce the increase so that they will get take-home pay of only $22,500.

For goodness sake, fellows. The people aren't that dumb.

They know Congressmen have to maintain two homes and contribute to everything from the smallest raffle to the party campaign chests.

They know Federal judges, at $15,000, make only a fraction of what they could command in private practice.

Please, gentlemen, just fix a fair figure, stick to it, and the people will understand and respect. No tricks of financial piety are called for.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of January 27, 1955]

QUESTION OF ADEQUATE PAY

If Congress should finally get around to an increase of pay for its Members and the Federal judiciary, it would not be action that had been taken on the initiative of the legislative body itself. Adequate compensation for the two groups has been repeatedly recommended but, with respect to its Members, Congress has held back through fear of the political consequences.

That explains the failure to act last year. But since this is not an election year the matter is up again and the belief is that something will be done. If so, it would be in response to the proposal of a Presidential commission with regard both to Congress and the Federal judges. And 9 years ago, when the congressional reorganization (streamlining) act was being adopted, it had been recommended by an impartial commission that legislative salaries be made $25,000 a year.

At the time Congress Members were paid $12,500 to which later was added an expense account of $2,500. The present pay, and that of Federal district judges, is now $15,000. The Presidential commission recommended $27,500 for both groups. It showed that on the basis of present money values the two would be better off by only about $1,300 compared with the salaries they were receiving in 1939.

Six years ago Congress voted higher pay for the President, Cabinet members, and others in the executive department. Also in the recent years of inflation and increased living costs the pay of Federal employees has been increased several times and further action in their behalf is expected soon.

Under bills shortly to have attention Congress Members would not be in line for the recommended total of $27,500. The exact figure is to be determined but the House measure would make it $22,500 with the present expense account of $2,500 eliminated. Federal district judges would receive whatever amount was agreed upon for Congress itself while appeals court judges and Supreme Court Justices would be granted advances on a different basis.

The purpose is not only just compensation but encouragement to men of competence to serve in offices of great responsibility. Politics ought to be discounted in attaining such important objectives.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of February 4, 1955]

HISTORY IN A PAY HIKE

It appears that Congress at last will vote to increase the pay of its members and that of the Federal judges. Hesitation with respect to itself has come from fear of the reaction by voters at home. That fear has

persisted despite impartial recommendations for an increase.

The Constitution gives Congress the power to determine its own compensation by law. But the public is not left without any power of action and Members of the legislative body are fully aware of that fact.

It doubtless explains why Congress has ventured to increase its pay only 5 times in the last 100 years. And more than 80 years ago there was a warning that perhaps will serve for all time. It arose from action that was unprecedented and may never occur again.

For in 1873 and at a time of numerous scandals about Washington the 42d Congress not only voted itself an increase in pay but made it retroactive for 2 years. It was in connection with a justified increase for the President, the Vice President, and Justices of the Supreme Court. But the action in behalf of Congress itself created a storm of public disapproval. It became known as the salary grab act and the back pay steal.

So violent was the public protest that it raised a big issue in the congressional elections of 1874. The increase was denounced by both parties and some of the Congress Members turned back their added pay while others gave the money to charity. Also the legislative act was repealed by the following Congress with an exception of the provisions relating to the President and the Supreme Court Justices.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) News of January 18, 1955]

BOOSTING FEDERAL PAY

At the current session of Congress bills will be considered proposing goodly pay increases for Members of Congress and the Federal judiciary.

Viewed in the light of how wages for workmen and remuneration for white-collar and professional men have advanced in recent years, and the insistent demand for a minimum wage of $1 per hour for the commonest of labor, the proposal for Congressmen and Federal judges does not seem unreasonable.

There is a reluctance, however, among some Members of both House and Senate because it might be politically unpopular. All House Members and one-third of the Senators will be up for reelection next year, and big pay boosts might well become a campaign issue in the 1956 presidential contest.

But this political angle shouldn't be given too much weight. The pay hike has been recommended by an outside commission and has general public support. Congress can avoid most of the possible stigma of selfishness by making the pay boost applicable only with the next session of Congress. That would require all Representatives and a third of the Senators to be reelected before benefiting from the act. There should be no qualm over raising the pay of judges. When a lawyer seeks a Federal judgeship nowadays, he must be financially able to accept the rather meager pay attached—much less than any good lawyer can earn in private practice.

Possibly the jump from $15,000 a year to $27,500 proposed by Senator HARRY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia, will be subject to compromise; increasing the number of expense-paid trips home from 1 a year to 6 may also be too much. Yet the granting of a substantial increase in the pay of Congressmen is essential to obtaining well-qualified men for the lawmaking posts.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune of February 18, 1955]

A RAISE FOR CONGRESS

Representative WICKERSHAM of Oklahoma has been subjected to quite a bit of "heat" since his highly publicized announcement that he was looking for part-time work to help make ends meet. However one reacts to the Wickersham incident, it does dramatize the question of how well those who represent us ought to be paid.

In January a year ago, a public commission unanimously urged Congress to boost the salaries of Senators and Representatives to $27,500. Substantial increases also were recommended for Supreme Court Justices and other members of the Federal judiciary.

Since then there has been rising pressure for a pay raise at this level. Now the House of Representatives has voted a $10,000 congressional boost and big increases for other top public servants. The Senate appears inclined to follow suit, although it has a smaller amount in mind.

Are such increases justified? We think they are.

Members of Congress, like other men in public life, are subject to heavy demands on their resources. They feel obliged to entertain constituents who come to see them; they must maintain homes both in Washington and in their own State.

A man capable of serving well in Congress would generally be able to earn more money in private endeavor. If salaries are boosted to a figure nearer what men of high quality could earn in private life, more of them will be attracted to politics. The price is little enough for the public to pay to get the best men available.

In its report a year ago the commission said that congressional and judicial salaries "are, and for a long time have been, grossly inadequate." Members of Congress have not received a pay raise since 1947. The arguments for an increase now heavily outweigh those against it.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post Gazette of February 4, 1955]

CORBETT MAIL POLL PROVES IKE'S PROGRAM IS POPULAR—CONGRESSMAN'S QUESTIONNAIRE FINDS VOTERS APPROVE ALL EXCEPT VOTING AGE CHANGE

WASHINGTON, February 3.—President Eisenhower's program, as set forth in his state of the Union message is popular in the 29th Pennsylvania Congressional District of Representative ROBERT J. CORBETT, Allegheny County.

The Congressman put in the mail immediately after the message was delivered to Congress, a questionnaire of 13 questions, based on the major points of the President's program.

The questionnaire went to every family in the congressional district and the response has been substantial.

VOTE AGE CHANGE LOSES

The replies show a large majority of the residents of the district approved every major point in the program but one. They disapproved lowering the voting age to 18 years by a percentage vote of 65 to 35.

But other issues received these approving percentage votes:

Do you approve the program in general? Yes, 90 to 10.

Should the budget be balanced prior to any important tax cuts? Yes, 83 to 17.

Do you believe that our expenditures for national defense are adequate? Yes, 76 to 24.

Should the Federal Government encourage and guarantee private health insurance programs? Yes, 51 to 49.

Should tariffs be selectively lowered through reciprocal trade agreements? Yes, 72 to 28.

Should the draft law be renewed? Yes, 85 to 15.

Should the minimum wage be raised to 90 cents an hour? Yes, 77 to 23.

Eisenhower says a salary raise for Members of Congress is long overdue. Do you agree? Yes, 64 to 36.

Should the incentives for men to remain in the military services be increased and the incentives to be discharged be reduced? Yes, 82 to 18.

Do you agree that the flexible price support program is a marked improvement? Yes, 88 to 12.

Eisenhower said "the transition to a peacetime economy is largely behind us. The economic outlook is good." Do you agree? Yes, 78 to 22.

Do you think the Eisenhower administration is making satisfactory progress in securing world peace? Yes, 81 to 19.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin of February 1, 1955]

UNDERPAID PUBLIC OFFICIALS

(By Ralph W. Page)

What's the matter with Congress? The studies and recommendations for reorganization suggest that its rules, privileges and procedures are archaic and render it incompetent to transact the national business. That is part of the trouble. Even more to the point are the pinch-penny, hopelessly inadequate salaries we give our Congressmen.

These public servants are in charge of the most important affairs in the country. Obviously, then, for these positions we should enlist the best brains and talents. In every other walk of life these brains and abilities are obtained by commensurate pay. Every corporation and enterprise in the country competes for the services of the trained and competent, so that these citizens earn 3 to 10 times the compensation offered our Representatives and Senators. Naturally the result is that these positions are sought by a residue composed either of men of independent means, self-sacrificing individuals with a mission, or those incapable of commanding more remuneration in the market place. Congress knows this, but the Members fear the public reaction to increasing their own pay—and the still prevalent provincial idea that there are plenty of candidates who will be glad to get the place at any price.

It is quite true that there is no dearth of mediocrity ready to continue to legislate for us on the cheap. So the problem is up to the country.

If we desire a competent legislature, the citizens themselves will have to demand that the Congress establish a schedule of compensation that will attract outstanding capacity, or at least relieve the incumbents of the present financial restrictions. This calls for active public support of a measure (S. 462) just introduced in the Senate by ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, and HARLEY M. KILGORE, Democrat, of West Virginia.

Following the recommendations of a congressional Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, this bill provides a salary of $27,500 instead of $15,000 for Congressmen, and at the same time raises the pay of judges, ranging from $27,500 for customs and tax courts to $30,500 for the court of appeals and $39,500 for the Supreme Court.

Regardless of the necessity to obtain the best talent for the posts, common justice demands that the services should be paid what they are worth. The burden and responsibility of these posts are enormous, and the amount of faithful and exhausting work done in spite of the handicaps is amazing. Some commentators contend that Congress and the judges deserve the raise on their record. Some certainly do. The rest would if the standard were raised.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 7, 1955]

HIGHER PAY FOR UNITED STATES JUDGES

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Judiciary Subcommittee have each

approved bills for the increase of salaries of Federal judges and Members of Congress. The House bill has still to be considered by the full Judiciary Committee.

Both bills provide for an increase of the salary of United States district judges from $15,000 a year to $22,500 a year, as well as somewhat greater increases in the salaries of judges of the United States courts of appeals and United States Supreme Court.

The proposed increases are, of course, an improvement over the present salary scale for Federal judges. But the proposed increases are still not enough. The bills should be passed promptly, but with the greater salary increases ($12,500 increases for United States district court judges) which have been recommended by the Presidential Commission that studied the problem. The judges of the State supreme court in the city of New York, whose jurisdiction is roughly comparable to that of the United States district court, receive salaries of $30,000 a year.

Service on the Federal judiciary is a great honor and a very rare privilege. In consequence it attracts candidates from among the ablest members of the bar. Concomitantly it is a very demanding service, calling for a very high order of erudition and experience, tireless effort in a rapidly expanding and changing body of law, undiluted devotion directed exclusively to the judicial task, avoidance of entangling commitments to other causes and activities—in short, complete self-dedication.

These requirements must, of necessity, suffer compromising adjustments when judges are obliged to seek supplementary income by teaching or writing, when they are not free from financial anxiety and when their days are clouded by worry concerning the insecurity of their families.

These considerations moved me, in 1950, to resign from the Federal bench despite the fact that I found the work most congenial to my spirit. Other judges have either resigned or have seriously considered that step, and I believe for the same reasons.

After long and careful investigation congressional committees have made recommendations which I believe are subject only to the criticism that they do not go far enough. I urge that the Congress pass a bill raising judicial salaries. If it is at all possible, I urge that the increases be the higher increases recommended by the Presidential Commission rather than the small increases which the congressional committees have thus far approved.

In this letter I have spoken only of judicial salaries because of my intimate interest in the problem. The same considerations are, I believe, applicable to congressional salaries. They, too, call for substantial correction.

SIMON H. RIFKIND.

NEW YORK, *February 3, 1955.*

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS,
Washington D. C., February 16, 1955.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The board of governors of the National Society of Public Accountants, a professional society representing accountants in public practice in every State and the Territories, has adopted the enclosed resolution, endorsing the recommendations of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries.

It is the desire of the board that its position with respect to the proposed salary increases be recorded with the Congress. I, therefore, request that you insert the enclosed resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Very truly yours,

JAY A. ROBINSON,
President.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS, NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Whereas the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries recommended in its report of January 15, 1954, certain salary increases for Members of Congress, the Vice President, Federal judges, and other Government officials; and

Whereas it is generally recognized that present salaries for Congressmen, judges, and others mentioned in the report are grossly inadequate for the qualifications required for these positions and the services rendered by the individuals holding these important offices; and

Whereas most Congressmen are confronted with the necessity of maintaining two homes and are burdened with numerous other expenses in connection with their official duties; and

Whereas citizens of this country cannot continue indefinitely to impose on the patriotic spirit of their public servants while salaries in private industry outstrip those paid legislators and judges; and

Whereas a great number of citizens of outstanding ability are now unavailable for service in these vitally important offices because they are unable to make the necessary financial sacrifices imposed by the existing salary scale: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of governors of the National Society of Public Accountants, As professional men in public practice, this body well realizes the unselfish service rendered by Members of Congress and the Judiciary. It is, then, the sense of this board that the present salary scale for these vital posts is grossly inadequate and represents a threat to the quality of our future lawmakers and judges. This board further believes that this "penny-wise and pound-foolish" policy of underpaying men we have selected to carry such a burden of public trust and responsibility cannot be justified on any basis; be it further

Resolved, That this body be recorded as favoring the recommendations contained in the report of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries; further

Resolved, That the board of governors of the National Society of Public Accountants urges all Members of Congress to support legislation introduced to accomplish this end.

JAY A. ROBINSON,
President.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1955.

To: Members of the United States Congress.
From: Robert Oliver, Assistant to the President and Director of CIO Legislative Committee:

Enclosed herewith you will find a resolution concerning the pending legislation to increase congressional and judicial salaries which was adopted unanimously by the CIO Executive Board at its meeting in Washington, D. C., on February 2, 1955.

This action by the CIO Executive Board follows the endorsement of the recommendations of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries which CIO Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey earlier forwarded to the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Judicial and Congressional Salaries.

The CIO realizes that there exists some misunderstanding of the merits of the pending legislation. We will make every effort throughout the country, both through our own membership as well as the general public, to show the rightness and justification of the proposed increases.

We urge you to proceed with the enactment of this legislation as rapidly as possible, confident that in the coming weeks a large segment of the population will be fully informed as to its complete justification.

CONGRESSIONAL AND JUDICIAL PAY RAISE

(Resolution adopted by the CIO executive board, February 2, 1955)

The CIO heartily approves the proposal to increase salaries of Members of Congress and Federal judges. We urge the leaders of both parties in both House of the Congress to unite behind the recommendations made last year by the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries to the end that they may be enacted into law as speedily as possible.

It has been 9 years since Congress and the Federal judiciary last received a salary increase. The result, during this period of high inflation and general salary increases for most segments of the economy, has been an increasing number of resignations of Members of Congress and judges to accept other more lucrative jobs in private industry.

The CIO believes that no body of men in the world have a greater responsibility than the Members of our great National Legislature and the judges who are called upon to interpret legislative enactments. Such responsibility must be met with adequate recompense.

Not only have congressional salaries never caught up with inflation, but in recent years they have never been entirely commensurate with the high demands made upon Congressmen. Even the top recommendation for an increase currently being considered by the Congress will, if enacted, still leave the pay of Members of Congress far below the salaries being paid to executives of business corporations whose work has far less responsibility to the public interest.

Enactment of the pay increases for Congress and the Federal judges at the top levels recommended by the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries will be an investment in good government that is long overdue. It should have the support of all citizens. We urge immediate passage of this legislation.

MEMPHIS AND SHELBY COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Memphis, Tenn., February 15, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

At a recent meeting the board of directors of the Memphis and Shelby County Bar Association considered the proposed judicial and congressional salary increase bill, which has been introduced into the Congress.

The board went on record as approving this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

S. SHEPHERD TATE,
Secretary.

EAST TENNESSEE PACKING CO.,
Knoxville, Tenn., February 15, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: It is our understanding there is a bill before Congress to increase the compensation of all Senators, Congressmen, and Federal judges. We are heartily in favor of any bill that will increase their compensation, as we think it is long past due. It is our belief that all right-thinking people are of this opinion.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

HERBERT J. MADDEN,
President.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 17, 1955]

THE HOUSE VOTES A RAISE

The House yesterday put away its fears of public reaction against a decent pay raise for its Members and voted in accord with the needs of the times and the responsibilities of Senators and Representatives. It is to be congratulated on facing up to the pay problem despite many unfair attacks on the motives of those who have sponsored the pay-raise bill. The House also voted an equally necessary raise for the Federal judiciary. If the raise is finally approved, it will be the first since 1946. Since then the average hourly earnings for manufacturing employees have increased by 70 percent and consumer prices have increased by 40 percent. The raise is essential if for no other reason than to enable Members of Congress and the judiciary to keep financially abreast of the times. Let us hope that the Senate will promptly follow the good example set by the House.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 18, 1955]

FAIR PAY FOR IMPORTANT WORK

There are two excellent reasons for raising the salaries of Members of Congress and Federal judges.

First, our Representatives, Senators, and interpreters of the law are worth more. It may be hard to measure responsibility and dignity in dollars and cents, but the people who hold these posts should not have to fret about making ends meet. The pay ought to be high enough so that legislators and judges are able to devote themselves to public duty with an unharassed sense of independence.

Second, almost everybody else in the country has been getting a pay raise. But the pay for Congress and the judiciary has stood still since 1946, when the levels were raised for the first time since 1925. One result is that there have been many cases of able men and women who dropped out because of economic pressure. They felt it was impossible to do their best for country or family on inadequate salaries. Others have struggled along by supplements from writing and lecturing.

This newspaper is delighted to see that the lawmakers are at last overcoming their timidity about voting increases. The House has overwhelmingly approved raising congressional salaries from $15,000 to $25,000, along with an extra $5,000 for the Vice President and Speaker, $10,000 more for the Supreme Court and circuit court justices, and $7,500 for the lower court judges. All this is long overdue; if anything, the judiciary should have fared even better. The proposed salary of $35,500 for the Chief Justice of the United States is decidedly modest, as is $22,500 for district judges.

Still the whole program is bound to attract superior talents to the high places of Government and keep them there. The Senate, we feel confident, will promptly add its approval.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 17, 1955]

CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE IS CALLED AMPLY JUSTIFIED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 16.—If the conscience of any Member of Congress hurts him about voting for that pay raise of $10,000 a year, there is an easy way out—to give back to the Treasury as much as he likes.

There's precedent for such a gift. Herbert Hoover gave back most of the Presidential salary he received while in the White House. He, himself, never revealed that fact but his friends have told about it. Maybe there are other public servants who have done the same thing and kept it secret.

What a proper salary for Members of Congress should be is a very serious matter and goes to the heart of the question of integrity in Government.

Many of those in the House of Representatives who voted against the proposed increase—which has yet to pass the Senate—did so because of a conscientious belief that the voters wouldn't approve of it. But it is important that the voters should know all the facts. For many Members who voted against the increase really deserve to have the higher salary to cover those expenses they have been trying to meet out of their own pockets. Likewise, some who voted for the increase did so out of consideration for the plight of their colleagues, though they themselves didn't need the extra money.

It all comes down to a simple proposition—the American people certain don't want only rich men in Congress, nor do they want to see Members accepting gratuities from constituents or big campaign contributions in appreciation of services they may have rendered.

NO FEE FOR SERVICES

Members of the House come up for election every 2 years, so they are constantly in need of campaign funds. Many of them supply it out of their own pockets rather than solicit gifts from constituents who seek special privileges. But the worst phase of the matter is the drain on the funds of a Member of Congress by residents of his district or State who feel their Congressman or Senator is something of an errand boy or personal representative in Washington.

Lots of the things done by Members of Congress for people back home are worth thousands of dollars to those who are benefited, yet there is no such thing as a service charge, or fee to be paid. Indeed, it would be highly improper for any such payment to be made.

If, for example, a new postoffice building or a defense installation or some other Federal project involving huge sums of money is brought to an area as a result of the efforts of a Member of either House, there are citizens who profit by the rise in real estate values and in other ways. They cannot and should not pay for that service. Yet, in the doing of that chore for the people, various expenses are often incurred and in many instances it is the Member of Congress who foots the bill rather than become involved in some transaction which a political opponent could some day uncover and use as a smear.

It is odd but members of national legislatures the world over have trouble about the size of their salaries. In Britain the Churchill government almost was overthrown last spring because the Labor Party insisted on a pay raise and the Conservatives opposed it. Many of them are wealthy and carry on extensive business interests. Only after some Conservatives deserted their leadership was the issue compromised. Today the pay of a member of the House of Commons is the equivalent of about $2,800 a year with an extra allowance they may request for each day the House sits. This amounts approximately to about an extra $740 a year. Curiously enough, the House members in London have no private offices or staffs provided by the government.

LEGISLATORS POORLY PAID

In France the pay is equivalent to about $5,000 a year and the 100 Communist Deputies contribute about $3,000 apiece directly to the party fund or approximately $300,000 a year, which is quite a sizable help in carrying on Communist propaganda.

In the State legislatures in this country members are poorly paid and it is a scandal that corporations with business before these bodies often retain as counsel for other services members who are lawyers. The labor unions do the same thing.

Many Members of Congress have outside income. Some earn it by getting large fees for speaking before labor unions and trade bodies of various kinds. Others still practice law before State courts. Some have large business interests or derive a big income from investments.

The raise in pay is needed in order to permit the election to Congress of citizens irrespective of their income status. A total of $25,000 a year, out of which comes $4,500 for taxes, or a net of $20,500, is not too much for a Member of either the House or the Senate to receive if he is honorably to serve his constituency.

TENNESSEE STATE ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Nashville, January 8, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: It appears that soon there will be a bill introduced to increase the salary of the Senators and Congressmen. This increase is far overdue, it is a shame that we the people will elect honest men to high positions to represent us, asking and demanding so many things of them, yet we expect them to exist on such a meager salary. We urge you to do all in your power to have this bill passed without delay.

Respectfully,

HARRY COSBY.

NASHVILLE BAR ASSOCIATION,
Nashville, Tenn., February 17, 1955.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator From Tennessee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed find copy of a resolution adopted by the Nashville Bar Association on January 27, 1955, recommending passage of the judicial-congressional salary increase bill now pending in Congress.

Yours very truly,

E. T. HOLLINS, Jr.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Be it resolved by the board of directors of the Nashville Bar Association, That this association endorses the passage of the judicial-congressional salary increase bill now pending before the Congress of the United States, and that a copy of such resolution be sent to the two Senators of the State of Tennessee, and the Representative in Congress from Davidson County.

THE TOLEDO BAR ASSOCIATION,
Toledo, Ohio, February 17, 1955.

The Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KILGORE: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Toledo Bar Association on February 11, 1955.

We strongly urge that you exert your efforts to bring about the passage of legislation to accomplish the purpose of the resolution.

Very truly yours,

ROGER SMITH,
President.

RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF TOLEDO BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas the Toledo Bar Association has on previous occasions gone on record as favoring legislation providing for salary increases for judges of the United States courts; and there are pending in the House and Senate bills which would, if enacted, help to relieve in varying degrees the inadequate salary of judges; and

Whereas the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries created pursuant to Public Law 220, 83d Congress, recommended increased salaries for judges and Members

of Congress in accordance with the following schedule:

Chief Justice of the United States	$40,000
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States	39,500
Speaker of the House of Representatives	40,000
Members of Congress	27,500
Judges of the United States Courts of Appeal	30,500
Judges of the U. S. Court of Claims	30,500
Judges of the Tax Court of the United States	27,500
Judges of the Court of Military Appeals	30,500
Judges of the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	30,500
Judges of the U. S. Customs Court	27,500
Judges of the United States district courts (including the U. S. District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska and the District Court of the Virgin Islands)	27,500

and this recommendation was duly endorsed by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association; and

Whereas the President of the United States in his state of the Union address to Congress in January 1955 strongly recommended that Congress take favorable action toward increasing salaries of Congressmen and judges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Toledo Bar Association endorse and urge the passage of legislation providing the increased salaries as shown in the above schedule; be it further

Resolved, That the Toledo Bar Association urge that appropriate salary increases be provided by legislation for United States attorneys and their assistants; be it further

Resolved, That notice of this resolution be mailed to the Senators and Members of Congress from Ohio and to the Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary; the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary; the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER; the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER; the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER; the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE; and the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUSH. Is it in order to call up my amendment at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. BUSH. I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, beginning with line 19, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 9 on page 8, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 601 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $22,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $35,000 per annum."

(b) Section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (relative to expense allowances of Members of Congress), is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President) is amended by striking out "$30,000" and substituting therefor "$35,000."

On page 8, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 3." and insert "Sec. 2."

On page 9, line 1, to strike out "Sec. 4." and insert "Sec. 3."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut wish the amendments to be considered en bloc?

Mr. BUSH. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is simply to strike from the bill all reference to congressional salaries, so that it would then become a bill dealing with salaries for the judiciary, although it would retain increased travel allowances for the Members of the Congress. The amendment would delete all reference to increases in congressional salaries.

Mr. President, this is a subject to which I suppose we have all given considerable thought. My opposition to the bill is not something which I have just developed. In a general way I have always felt about the matter of congressional salaries as I feel today.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I should like to say at this time, inasmuch as I may have to leave the city shortly, that I should like to support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which would require that the budget of the United States be in balance before such increases would go into effect. I would vote for that amendment, although I would expect that if it should be agreed to, the question of judicial salaries would be taken up as a separate matter. I see no sense in tying judicial salaries with congressional salaries. I think the two situations are entirely different, and should not be considered together, but should be considered separately.

Mr. President, the bill calls for an increase of 50 percent in the salaries of the Members of the Congress. I think that is a very large increase indeed. It is not a cost-of-living raise. It is a very large compensatory increase in salary.

While we are talking about that, there are in committee bills to which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] referred, proposing to raise the salaries of postal workers and other Government employees 5 or 7 or 10 percent. We cannot make up our minds how much the increase should be, but we are talking in terms of 5 percent up to 10 percent. At the same time, Mr. President, we are talking about raising the compensation of the Members of the Congress by 50 percent. We are talking about an increase of $7,500. That is double the entire salary of many Federal workers whose increase in salary we have been discussing for 2 years, trying to decide whether there should be an increase of 5 or of 10 percent.

In good conscience, I simply cannot vote for a salary increase for Members of the Congress of such a large amount under any conditions, and especially when we have failed to come to an agreement as to what should be done with regard to increasing the salaries of postal and other Government employees and are talking about such a relatively small increase for them as compared with the proposed increase in our own salaries.

Mr. President, there must be reason brought into the discussion of this question. If we vote ourselves a salary increase of $7,500, or, as the House voted, $10,000, how in the world are we going to be able to control all the expenses in the way of salaries? I think we would be put in an almost indefensible position.

To point up that proposition a little more closely, we are talking about a weekly increase of approximately $4 for the postal worker, but have not done anything about it; a $5-a-week increase for the military; and a $200-a-week increase for Members of Congress.

I oppose the bill, therefore, on the ground that the increase is much too large. I shall give other reasons why I oppose the bill.

I said a moment ago that I favor the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I shall support it. I think Congress ought to be able to come to grips with the fiscal disorder which has troubled the Government for a good many years. If we cannot control the finances of the United States well enough to balance the national budget, certainly we should not be talking in terms of a 50-percent compensatory increase in the salaries of Members of Congress.

While I would not favor any increase at this time, for reasons which the distinguished Senator from Delaware will advance, and which, obviously, are behind the purposes of his amendment, I will not say that I would forever oppose an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress. I do not say that I would oppose a modest increase after some of the other things I have mentioned were done. But, I definitely wish to state, in case I am not here to record my vote, that I am entirely in sympathy with the philosophy embodied in the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

I think that the two questions—of increases in salaries for judges and for Members of the Congress—should be separated. I believe the judges should have an increase in their salaries. I have read carefully the Segal report. A serious situation seems to exist in many States with respect to the law of supply and demand. I do not know the situation in all the States, but in the States with which I am familiar I find that the State judgeships are valued very much more highly than are Federal judgeships. I know that is the case in the State of Connecticut. I know that when there was a vacancy in the Federal district court in Connecticut in 1953, great difficulty was experienced in finding a person upon whom my distinguished colleague [Mr. PURTELL] and I could agree was sufficiently qualified that we, in good conscience, could recommend him for that Federal judgeship. We finally were able to persuade a man of the very highest type, of whom we are very proud, Judge Anderson, to leave the State bench and to accept the Federal judgeship, which he did at considerable personal sacrifice to himself, and as a very patriotic move on his part. At that time I for one assured him that I hoped

that the pay of Federal judges would be increased substantially, so that eventually he, perhaps, would have made no financial sacrifice in giving up his State judgeship to take the Federal judgeship.

So, as I say, I favor an increase in salaries for Federal judges. A Federal judge must divorce himself from any other sources of earned income, and devote all his time—100 percent of it—to the business of the Federal bench.

That is not true of Members of Congress. It never has been true. Many Members hold connections with business and professional organizations of different kinds. While all Members do not do so, at least most of them have been able to retain their interests in automobile agencies, law firms, radio, television, and the newspaper business, and similar kinds of enterprises. I see nothing wrong with that. I think it is good to have in Congress men of affairs, who know what it means to operate businesses, or who practice law. I think that is good. I do not believe it ought to be discouraged. But it does suggest that men need not completely sever themselves from sources of earned income if they enter Congress.

That is not so with the judiciary. For that reason I think the two branches should be considered in separate bills, not in one, and that the situation with respect to the Federal judges should be considered on a different basis.

Fundamentally, as a Member of the Congress, I hold this philosophy: Membership in Congress is a service job. I have read the Segal report. It makes comparisons with corporation salaries of $120,000 and salaries of labor leaders ranging from $20,000 to $50,000, and draws the conclusion from those incomes that congressional salaries are much too low. But I suggest there are other comparisons which are valid. I suggest that the position of a Member of Congress, which I think of as a service job, is more to be likened to the position of the teacher in a school or of the principal of a high school, of ministers of the church, of doctors and lawyers in our small towns. To most persons in those categories, a salary of $15,000 is no obstacle to entering the service of the Congress of the United States. In fact, it would attract most of them, because many of them do not make anywhere near that much money.

So I feel that an entirely different situation exists with respect to salaries of Members of Congress than exists in the case of salaries of Federal judges.

I do not think, frankly and ideally, that Congress is a place for a person to seek a position if he is more interested in making money than he is in performing a public service.

I do not blame anyone who wishes to go into the service of a corporation and to do just as well as he can. I have no objection to that. Such persons render very great service to our country. They manage large and small organizations, which provide jobs for hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, of people; and that is what makes this Nation tick. They deserve all the respect in the world. But it is not necessary to have the pay of Members of Congress geared so as to attract such persons into service in Congress.

Therefore, I do not believe that the philosophy of the Segal report is at all satisfactory in connection with the matter of reward and compensation for Members of Congress. I do not consider that the report has drawn valid comparisons.

I think of the principal of the high school in my own town of Greenwich, Conn. I should say, without fear of contradiction by anybody in that town, that he would be very well qualified, if he chose to do so, to sit in Congress. Yet he does not receive $15,000; he gets, I think, $10,000. There are many others like him all over the United States.

So people like him stay in the professions they have chosen, because they want to dedicate themselves to the services of their communities. They are not interested in their work simply to make money out of it. They are interested in it because they like it, and because they get their reward, not from any material return, but from the satisfactions that go with performing work of that kind. I rather hold to the view that that is also the best kind of satisfaction one can get from service as a Member of Congress.

I notice that whenever there have been vacancies in recent years, there has been no great trouble about filling them. There has been no dearth of applicants. Let a Member of the Senate resign—I care not from what State he comes—and immediately there will be several applicants for the position. The law of supply and demand does not suggest that the pay is not sufficiently large to attract persons to these positions. Everyone who has come here, and who is here now, was attracted to the position by a vacancy. I know that in the last election there were certainly many more candidates for the positions than there were winners. Moreover, many candidates were defeated in the primaries within their own parties.

So I do not believe the law of supply and demand suggests that the salary is very greatly out of line, or that it needs anything in the nature of a 50-percent boost.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks on this subject. I am sorry to find myself at variance with so many distinguished Senators, whom I hold in the highest esteem. I hope that no Members will feel that what I have said in defense of my philosophy on the subject is in the slightest degree a reflection upon their views. One has to make up his own mind about matters of this kind.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator believe that the Segal report with relation to the proposed salaries for the judiciary is based upon a fair premise and sound reasoning?

Mr. BUSH. I may say to the distinguished Senator, as I said earlier in my remarks, that I think the situation in the judiciary is different, and that there should be a substantial increase in the pay of the members of the judiciary. I do not take much issue with the Segal report so far as judiciary salaries are concerned.

Mr. PURTELL. Since my colleague felt that the reasoning was sound with regard to judiciary salaries, my inquiry was whether that same body, which gave the same amount of time, the same study, and the same investigation to the question of congressional salaries was wrong in its conclusions and recommendations concerning such salaries.

Mr. BUSH. I think the members of the Commission were quite wrong with regard to their conclusions regarding congressional salaries, and I think they made a great mistake in lumping the two groups together, because the two categories are not the same, and yet they came out with the same answer for both groups.

Mr. PURTELL. Would the Senator feel that one of the prerequisites for membership in the Congress, whether it be in the House or the Senate, should be either inherited or acquired wealth before becoming a Member of Congress?

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator repeat the question?

Mr. PURTELL. I think I had better repeat the question. Is it the Senator's opinion that one of the tests for ability to serve in the House or the Senate should be either inherited or acquired wealth before becoming a Member of Congress?

Mr. BUSH. No; I say to the Senator I would not say there should be any such test.

Mr. PURTELL. Would the Senator agree with me that while it is true the average age of Senators is 57, it is also true that many who have come to the Senate in the past and probably many who are presently Members of Congress, because of their not having engaged in business before becoming Members of Congress, perhaps do not have as much of the world's goods as others have been able to accumulate? My experience has been that many Members of the House of Representatives, with growing families and children who have to be sent to school, find it impossible to make ends meet. Does the Senator agree with me that such persons do have difficulty in trying to make ends meet, in view of the fact that they have two homes to maintain, are trying to educate their children, and at the same time are trying to meet the demands of their constituents by going back and forth between their respective districts and Washington? May I further ask the Senator if he thinks such persons should deny to their loved ones some of the necessities, in the way of education and otherwise, that more wealthy men can give their families and children?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I would remind the Senator that such persons are not compelled by any requirement except their own preference to serve in the House. There is no compulsion for such persons to remain Members of the House if they do not think the reward is satisfactory and they find themselves in a position of hardship such as the Senator has suggested. I think the same argument might be made as to school teachers, school principals, professors in uni-

versities, doctors, and ministers of the church. What I am saying is that I do not think that Members of Congress should necessarily be compensated entirely by their salaries; that their reward should come in part at least from a spirit of satisfaction in rendering service.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator believe that the salaries should be so low as to preclude from an opportunity to serve in Congress many persons who have growing families and who would like to serve in legislative bodies, but cannot because the salaries do not permit them to do justice to their families and also carry on their duties as legislators?

Mr. BUSH. I simply say to the Senator that I do not think the salaries should be fixed at such a rate that anybody who wanted to do so could make money from service in Congress. From what I have been able to observe, I think we would find plenty of qualified applicants to fill the jobs. As I said a while ago, whenever a vacancy exists there seems to be no dearth of applicants to fill the vacancy. We are not in such bad shape. I think the Members of both the Senate and the House present a very good cross-section of the people of the United States. Frankly, I do not believe increasing the salaries as proposed in the bill would result in improvement in the general quality of the Members of either House.

Mr. PURTELL. Has the Senator read, and I am sure he has, some of the statements which were made by Members of the House relative to their inability to make ends meet—not to make money, but to make ends meet—and to give their families what they are entitled to? Has the Senator read some of those statements?

Mr. BUSH. I have read some of those statements. I think the Senator is personalizing an argument which should be looked at objectively. As I said before, if such a person finds it difficult to make ends meet, and he could do better elsewhere, then let him do what he wants to do elsewhere. I do not think the fact that one man cannot make ends meet necessarily means that the salary scale should be changed or increased by 50 percent.

Mr. PURTELL. In other words, the Senator feels that if one with a growing family and having no inherited or acquired wealth finds himself unable to meet the demands of his family, he ought not to run for office?

Mr. BUSH. No; I would not say that.

Mr. PURTELL. Would the Senator draw that conclusion?

Mr. BUSH. No; I would not draw that conclusion.

Mr. PURTELL. If the salaries are not sufficient to sustain growing families of men younger than either my distinguished colleague or myself, are we not denying them the right to serve, because they must make a choice between fulfilling their duties to their families and carrying on their duties to their constituencies?

Mr. BUSH. The same argument might be applied to ministers of the church or school teachers. The point is, What does a man want to do with his life? If he wishes to serve the church, he will go into the church, with the knowledge that he is not going to become rich, but will get a modest reward. If such a person wishes to teach in school, he will go into the profession of teaching for the satisfaction he will get out of it, knowing that his salary will not be very large, but that he will be rewarded by the satisfaction that he gets from teaching. The same thing is true of doctors. In most of the towns in the State of Connecticut, I doubt that there are many doctors, when one considers the number of them, who are making as much as $15,000 a year.

In my judgment the problem should not be looked at personally, because while A, B, and C may be having a difficult time to make ends meet, what should be considered is what is best for the country as a whole. If Mr. A, B, and C find it is difficult, there is nothing to stop them from leaving, so that Mr. X, Y, and Z may fill the vacancies when they occur, as has been done for 165 years.

Mr. PURTELL. If Mr. A, B, and C cannot carry on because they lack other means for sustaining themselves, and Mr. D, E, and F can do so because they have inherited or acquired wealth, we would then have a situation where certain segments of our population would be denied the opportunity to serve because of their inability to sustain themselves on the salaries fixed.

Mr. BUSH. I do not agree with the Senator. It was brought out in the debate last year that many Members of Congress found their salaries to be satisfactory, and even to be larger than what they had been previously earning. I am glad they found that to be the situation, but I do not think the Senator's frequent references to acquired or inherited wealth have anything to do with the question. The answer depends somewhat on the type of job one regards service in Congress to be—whether it is a compensatory or truly a service job. Over the years legislative salaries have not been comparable to the salaries paid in the judicial or executive branches of Government. In our State, the Senator knows that the legislative salaries are very low. Legislators in the State of Connecticut, a group which includes many able men and women, receive $600. Of course, the legislature meets for only a few months, once a year, unless there is a special session. Heretofore in the history of this Government, salaries of Members of Congress have not kept pace with executive salaries, and I do not think it is necessary that they should. I do not believe the circumstances of 1 individual or 100 individuals who may be in the Congress are important. In my judgment, the question is what is best for the country, and what is going to attract a satisfactory quality of person to the Congress. I believe that with the present salary level the Members of Congress are of good quality. I see no reason why we should not have equally qualified Members tomorrow or in the future. While I am not opposed to any reasonable increase in salaries to Members of Congress, I am opposed to the proposal at the present time.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator feel that a person who has family responsibilities, such as providing for youngsters, and at the same time a desire to serve the people in a legislative body, should be forced to make the choice of one or the other, in view of the fact that such a person would find that he would not be able to serve in the legislative body?

Mr. BUSH. I say to the Senator that we always have to make choices to live within our means, whatever they may be. Everyone has to make a choice as to whether he should take a position which is attractive, but which he cannot afford to take but there is no compulsion on the part of anyone to seek office. The seeking of the office is done voluntarily. There is nothing to compel a man either to seek or to remain in office.

Mr. PURTELL. It is not a question of seeking office. It is a question of circumstances being such as to prevent certain persons from seeking office because they would be financially unable to achieve a satisfactory standard of living.

Mr. BUSH. No matter how high the salaries were made, it would always be found that they were too low for some persons. My own judgment is that if the salaries were raised as provided by the bill, there would not be attracted to the Congress a more qualified group of persons than now constitute it.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator agree with me that we might be able to retain many members of legislative bodies who have felt they could not continue in office because of the responsibility they owed to their families?

Mr. BUSH. My guess would be that if the passage of the bill should fail we would not lose, because of the reasons the Senator has set forth, any more Members than we have lost in a typical year. I do not think the failure to pass the bill would have any effect whatsoever on the quality of the membership of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the senior Senator from Connecticut realize that both the CIO and the A. F. of L. have endorsed this bill?

Mr. BUSH. I realize that; but frankly, I am not terribly impressed by it.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from Connecticut name one Member of this body who is a laboring man? I am speaking of a man who works with his hands.

Mr. BUSH. At the moment I am looking at a gentleman who, I understand, has represented and represents labor unions; and I assume that he, himself, is a union member. Therefore, in answer to the question of the Senator from North Dakota, I name the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA].

Mr. LANGER. Since the Senator from Connecticut has named the Senator from Michigan, can the Senator

from Connecticut name a Member of this body who is a farmer?

Mr. BUSH. In response, I name the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. LANGER. I have understood that he raises 1½ million chickens a year.

Mr. BUSH. Yes, he is a chicken farmer.

Mr. LANGER. I am referring to a Member of this body—if the Senator from Connecticut can name one—who gets up at 4 o'clock in the morning and goes into the barn and milks half a dozen cows.

Mr. BUSH. I suggest that possibly the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] might be classified as a farmer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to advise the Senator from North Dakota that I am looking for some cheap labor on Saturdays; so he can come out to my farm and work for me. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSH. Then I give the Senator from North Dakota the Senator from Oregon. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota, but I must say that he is just as wild regarding his estimates on the production of chickens as he is regarding some of the other statements coming from North Dakota. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I simply wish to make clear the effect of the amendment which our esteemed and distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], has offered. He proposes to strike out the part of the bill which relates to a salary increase for the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and thus leave in the bill only the part relating to a salary increase for the members of the judiciary.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct—plus the travel allowance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; plus the travel allowance.

Mr. President, I do not believe the bill should thus be separated. It seems to me that if that were to be done, the proper time to make such a case was on July 20, 1953, when the resolution creating the salary commission was before the Senate. I have examined the RECORD which was made on that occasion. I find that no objection was raised by any Senator, on either side of the aisle, with respect to that measure. I find that no motion was made to strike from the resolution the reference to congressional salaries. In short, the proposal was to have the commission investigate both the salaries of the judiciary and the salaries of the Members of Congress, including the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate. If there had been a desire on the part of some Member of Congress to strike out one part of that measure, so as to make a differentiation as between the salaries of those who are appointed and the salaries of those who are elected, it seems to me that such a case should have been made at that time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I think the Senator from Illinois has a good point. However, I should like to say that I filed a statement on this matter with the Segal Commission, outlining about what I have stated today. So I feel at least partially not guilty of the charge my colleague has made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well. However, the appropriate time would have been when that debate was occurring on the floor of the Senate, during the calendar call. Every Member had full opportunity at that time to express his views on the matter. However, no such separation as between the judiciary and the legislative branch was proposed.

So the Segal Commission went to work. It did its work excellently. The chairman did a superb job, in my opinion.

The Commission was a representative one; it represented every field of activity—including both labor, business, and the professions. Of course, six Members of Congress stood in the position of advisers to the Commission, although the Commission did the work itself, and the Members of Congress did not share in the ultimate decisions the Commission made. I think the Commission received testimony from approximately 70 persons. Testimony amounting to approximately 800 pages was taken. Very few persons submitted a contrary view.

After the report of the Commission was made, the bar associations of a great many States endorsed it, and made no effort to differentiate as between the salaries of the Members of Congress and the salaries of the judiciary, or to have a separation made as between the two. I note from the hearings that the bar associations of Virginia, Georgia, New York, Texas, California, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Arkansas, North Carolina, Indiana, South Dakota, Delaware, New Mexico, Michigan, Missouri, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and Montana have endorsed the report. I notice that the American Bar Association has also endorsed it.

No effort was made on the part of the Attorney General to bring about a segregration of this issue and to have Congress act separately on a proposal for an increase in the salaries of the judiciary and a proposal for an increase in the salaries of the Members of Congress. The Attorney General appeared before the so-called Kefauver committee and endorsed the report in its entirety. In his state of the Union message, the President of the United States made no endeavor to separate the two.

So, Mr. President, since the matter is here as the result of a study by a Commission which was authorized and empowered to investigate thoroughly both the salaries of the Members of Congress and the salaries of the judiciary, certainly there would be no point in separating them at this good hour, when the bill is before the Senate, and when a comparable bill was passed by a very substantial majority in the House of Representatives.

Therefore, Mr. President, I trust that the amendment submitted by my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], will be rejected by a decisive vote.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield at this point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I heard the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] speak several times about the salaries of doctors. If the Senator will examine the task forces reports, he will find in it the following statement:

> The average income of doctors in 1951 was $13,432.

Mr. BUSH. On what page of the task forces reports is that statement to be found?

Mr. KEFAUVER. On page 38.

I read further from that page:

> Dr. Murray, of the New Jersey Medical Society, stated that it was his opinion that at the age of 40, doctors averaged between $20,000 and $25,000 a year, and that that average was increased as the doctor became 50 or more.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me at this time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee about his statement that the average income of doctors in 1951 was $13,432.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was reading that paragraph of the reports of the task forces. At that part of the reports, Dr. Murray, of the New Jersey Medical Society, is quoted as stating as his opinion that at the age of 40, doctors average between $20,000 and $25,000 a year.

Mr. BUSH. To what area does that statement relate? Does it relate to the State of New Jersey, only?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is from the reports of the task forces, giving the comparable salaries of the various professions.

Mr. BUSH. Is that statement made, regardless of its application to any particular section of the country?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; it applies to all areas of the United States.

Mr. BUSH. Then I should like to say that I wish to see some substantial support of the statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that a good deal of the argument today has actually missed the mark. I doubt very much that the office of a Member of Congress can be compared with any other station. I think the Segal Commission set forth the matter in one short paragraph on page 5 of its report, when it said:

> Finally, there is the overriding factor of justice. The salary adjustments we recommend will, we think, correct inequities of long-standing. We believe they are conso-

nant with the dignity and the stature the citizens of the country attach to these critical offices.

I think that is the point in a nutshell. The King of England may receive $500,000 a year; I do not know. I know that he cannot eat any more than can the junior Senator from Illinois, if my appetite is in good form. [Laughter.] I do not believe the King of England can wear any more clothes at one time than I can. I am confident that he cannot smoke more than one cigar at a time.

So, Mr. President, if the matter is put on a creature basis, I do not know where finally one comes out. But I believe that in the minds of the people of the country, a certain dignity and a certain stature attach to the office of Member of Congress, even though some of our constituents do not always attach that dignity and that stature to the occupant of the office. [Laughter.]

Yet, the fact of the matter is that this stature and this dignity go with the office itself. There are 435 Members of the House of Representatives—no more and no less; and they are chosen from among the 165,000,000 people of the United States. In this body there are 96 Members, according to the Constitution of the United States; and they can be added to only in proportion as other States are admitted to the sisterhood of States, under the Federal Union.

Mr. President, clearly a dignity and a stature go with the office of Member of Congress. Thus it is that I believe that what the commission recommends in this case is quite consonant with the attributes of the office. I think that is the crux of the matter, and I believe we should keep it on that fundamental basis.

So, Mr. President, I earnestly hope that the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut will not prevail.

The work done in connection with getting these reports to us has been a long-term operation. I confess to you very freely, Mr. President, that even in 1946, when I was on the Joint Committee on Legislative Reorganization, along with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], former Senator La Follette, and a good many other Members of the Congress, we—and I say this frankly—had to provide in the legislative reorganization bill for a salary increase for the Members of the Congress, in order to get that legislative reorganization job done. The expense allowance for Members of Congress was finally written in to it in the form of an amendment submitted on the floor of the House and on the floor of the Senate; but that was not the contriving of the joint committee.

At the time, I gave a great deal of attention to that matter, feeling that there should be adequate and reasonable take-home pay in connection with this job—and no less than in connection with any other job—because a very wise man by the name of Luke wrote, probably several thousand years ago, that—

The laborer is worthy of his hire.

Mr. President, whether it is in the domain of public service or elsewhere, the laborer is still worthy of his hire.

If there be in the United States persons who today are inadequately compensated that is a tragedy which should be remedied; but that is no reason why our own difficulty should not be resolved when the opportunity to do so arises.

Mr. President, it has been indicated that we should not do this so long as the budget is in a state of imbalance. But, I wish to remind my friend, the Senator from Delaware, and my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, that in the past 22 years, the budget has been out of balance in 21 of those years.

Mr. President, since 1945, five pay increases have been granted in the Federal establishment. They aggregate a little more than 51 percent. There was the pay act of 1945 and at that time the budget was not in balance. We enacted the pay act of 1946, and the budget was not in balance. We enacted the pay act of 1948, and the budget was in balance. We enacted the pay act of 1949 and the pay act of 1951, and both times the budget was not in balance.

Must we be in the unhappy position of having to spar around in trying to find a year when the budget is right, when the circumstances are right, when the mental outlook is right, and then suddenly rush in under the tent?

If so, we would have had only three chances in 26 years to repair the salary status of Members of the House and of the Senate. We have been appropriating salary increases for everyone in the structure of government. That does not seem to have bothered anyone in the House or in the Senate. We have raised some of the salaries and have added one or two classifications. It has reached the point where a GSA 18 employee receives a salary of more than $14,000. He does not have to be elected to office.

Whatever is fair, is fair. Therefore, I do not believe there is any substance to the argument that the budget must be balanced before we should do justice to ourselves.

If I must make the bread and butter argument—and I am not too happy about it—and if we measure the proposed increase in terms of 1939, we are still $200 under the purchasing power of the congressional salary fixed in 1939.

Let us consider the depreciation of the dollar. In those days, when a Member of the House and of the Senate received $10,000, his income tax was $372, and he had 9,628 hard, 100-percent dollars with which to buy things. We are still behind the game, so to speak, on the raise in salary of $2,500 in 1946. Twenty-two thousand, five hundred dollars, express in terms of 1939 dollars, is still $200 behind the 1939 level in terms of purchasing power. If we talk about take-home pay, that is what it amounts to. I would much rather talk about what I believe to be adequate compensation, and compensation that is commensurate with the dignity and status of elective office in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. When I received a salary of $7,500 a year on becoming a Member of the House of Representatives—which was the salary the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] received when he came to the Senate in 1922—the $7,500 during those years would buy more than $22,500 will buy today. There can be no question about it.

I am talking about the rent we have to pay in Washington, about the cost of living, and about the income tax we must pay. Therefore, I believe $7,500 in those days was really, in effect, more money than we will get if the proposed increased is voted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Arizona is absolutely correct.

Therefore I utter the hope that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], on which we shall vote shortly, which amendment would eliminate congressional pay increases entirely, and let stand in the bill only judicial salary increases, will be voted down with real vigor and with great unanimity.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to make the first of several speeches in opposition to the pending bill. During the course of the debate I shall discuss a series of amendments to it.

I sincerely hope that after the debate tonight we may have some kind of understanding to vote on the bill on Wednesday, because I believe many of the amendments which are to be offered should lie on the table temporarily and be carefully considered. For the life of me I cannot understand the rush to pass the bill today. It is a bill which ought to receive very careful study by the Members of the Senate, particularly the amendments which are to be offered.

Likewise, Mr. President, I believe it to be important that we have yea and nay votes. Unfortunately, some of my colleagues inform me that there is not a great inclination for yea and nay notes on amendments to the bill. That does not make a pretty record, if it be true. I believe the people of the United States are entitled to have the Senate vote yea and nay on these matters. I shall do my best to urge yea and nay votes. If necessary, I shall do my best to discuss the matter until we do have some yea and nay votes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I know of no Senator who is opposed to a yea and nay vote on this issue. As chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill I shall do my best to have yea and nay votes on the passage of the bill and on any amendment that may be offered to it.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Tennessee join me in asking for a yea and nay vote on the Bush amendment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Certainly I will.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Bush amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MORSE. That is my answer to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It should be stated that not many of the Members of the Senate are on the floor at the present time.

Mr. MORSE. A sufficient number of Members are in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure that if the Senator will renew the request later we shall have no difficulty getting a yea and nay vote.

Mr. MORSE. A sufficient number of Senators are present to order a yea and nay vote if there were a will to do so.

Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset that I do not share the point of view expressed by my good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], that 1953, when the resolution was before the Senate, was the time for Members of the Senate to take a position as to whether there should be a separate bill for congressional salaries. The resolution of 1953 was simply a resolution which called for the appointment of a commission to study the subject of judicial and congressional salaries.

Nothing in that resolution directly or indirectly committed any Member of the Senate to vote for a bill combining judicial and congressional salaries. I doubt if any Member of the Senate at the time the resolution was before the Senate had the slightest idea that by voting for the resolution, to use the argument of the Senator from Illinois, we became committed to a procedure for a combined bill, rather than separate bills.

All we did was to vote for the appointment of a commission to study judicial and congressional salaries. It was right that we should do so. I believe it was right that we should have the situation studied. Now the time has come to debate the conclusions of the study. Now is the time to pass judgment on whether we should approach the problem in a combined bill or in separate bills.

Not the slightest obligation is placed upon the shoulders of any Senator to go along with a combined bill rather than separate bills merely because in 1953 he voted for a proposal to study the question of salaries.

I believe the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is quite right in maintaining that the two issues should be separated, and in his amendment he proposes that judicial salaries be considered separate and distinct from congressional salaries. I shall support his amendment, and I shall offer a few amendments of my own.

The first point I wish to make is that in my judgment, Members of Congress are now well paid. In my opinion, they are paid all they are worth.

For the reason brought out by the Senator from Connecticut, when one enters a life of public service, if he is going to represent the best interests of the public, he should not go into it with the idea of making money out of it. I think $15,000 a year, which is what we really receive, $12,500 and the so-called expense allowance of $2,500, is a good salary for the job. I think it is in the best interests of the American people that membership in Congress shall not be made attractive for fiscal reasons; that it shall not be made attractive because the holder of it can make money out of it. We have enough evils in American machine politics without giving political machines other motivating influences, such as highly paid jobs. In my judgment, an increase in salary will not increase the number of freemen in the Congress of the United States. On the contrary, in my opinion, an increase in the salaries of Members of the Congress will enhance a dangerous tendency in American politics by putting undue pressure and influence upon political officeholders. I have always said, and I repeat today, that when we get to the bottom of political financing in America we will be dealing with the primary cause of corruption in American politics. I believe the people will have to do something about that problem, and I do not think we shall be moving in the right direction by increasing the salaries of the Members of Congress 50 percent, to $22,500, as proposed by the Senate bill, or to $25,000, as the House bill proposes.

Mr. President, I am very much interested in the report of the Segal Commission. I turn to page 37 where the Commission uses argument by analogy, which frequently is a dangerous argumentative technique, for often argument by analogy is of itself inherently fallacious. But we read on page 37 of the report that the heads of farm cooperatives received from $20,000 to $50,000, and that the head of the National Grange is paid more than $15,000 a year.

We are told that Farms and Farm People, a cooperative report by the United States Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, shows that the average net money income from class II commercial farms, which include those which sold farm products worth $25,000 or more, was $8,880 in 1949, and, based upon preliminary reports, the 1953 return will be approximately the same.

The report goes on to say:

> To this must be added about $600 for produce consumed in the farm household at farm prices rather than through retail stores, and rental value of farm buildings.

The report goes on to say:

> It is noteworthy that the highest proposed salary for Members of Congress mentioned in the record is the $75,000 in the Farm Journal, the farm magazine with the largest circulation (3 million) in the Nation.

Then it says:

> Most of the lawyers who testified, and those included ex-judges and ex-Congressmen who resigned for reasons of personal economy, were of the opinion that the earning power of either a judge or Congressman in the field of private law practice would range upward from $30,000.

In horse trading we would call that "puffing." It is the old David Harum technique. But, in my judgment, Mr. President, it is not factual.

The report goes on to say:

> This is not an extravagant estimate when the mean net income of all nonsalaried lawyers in 1951 was $8,730.
>
> In the same year the general counsel of 46 American railroads earned an average of $30,590, with a range from $15,260 for the Kansas City Southern to $66,000 for the Pennsylvania Railroad system. Thirty railroads paid their general counsels at least $25,000. The average salary of the general solicitors, the second in rank of counsel, with respect to the 46 railroads was $25,875 with a range from $16,526 for the Virginian Railroad Co. to $44,000 for the Pennsylvania Railroad system.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment I shall be happy to yield for a question.

I continue reading from the report:

> The average salary of general counsel in 1939, with respect to those railroads whose president was paid as much as $40,000 in 1951, was $22,529. This represents an increase of approximately 35 percent in 1951 salaries over those of 1939.
>
> The average income of doctors in 1951 was $13,432. Dr. Murray, of the New Jersey Medical Society stated that it was his opinion that at the age of 40, doctors averaged between twenty and twenty-five thousand a year and that that average was increased as the doctor became 50 or more.

With all that opinion evidence, Mr. President, I ask the question, So what? What has it got to do with the issue as to whether we as public servants who have accepted public service for the duration of our terms at least, and who have undertaken to serve in the way we think we can best contribute to our fellow men, should increase our salaries 50 percent? The argument, I suggest, is based upon the fallacious premise that public life is some form of private enterprise and that we should have salaries commensurate with making a substantial profit. I say that those who seek profit ought to go into private business.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia, with the understanding that I yield for a question and with the further understanding that I shall not lose my rights to the floor for any period of time used in protecting my rights in case a question should not be asked.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I desire only to ask a question of the Senator from Oregon, whom I greatly love and admire.

I wonder if the Senator from Oregon has studied the trends of the times, and I ask him if he knows that in my State salaries have been raised from 100 percent, in some cases to 200 percent. I am speaking from actual statistics and personal experience when I say that. I am wondering if the Senator realizes that it is impossible to live properly in Washington on our present salaries, unless one owns his own home and has no rent to pay.

I may say to the distinguished Senator that I should love to go back to those dear old days when I first came to Washington, when I could go to the shops and the market place and buy food cheaply, and could also pay for house rental and other things as I did 14 years ago. I ask the distinguished Senator if he realizes

what has taken place in Washington during the past several years. When we removed price controls which existed during the war and immediately after the war, we also gave the profiteers a golden chance. Likewise we removed the surplus-profits tax. Was not the Senator from Oregon in the same status in which I was when the excess-profits tax was stricken from the statute books?

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senator that we have been in the same status for many years.

Mr. KILGORE. But we are faced with the results of that action. Price controls were removed and we were hit right on the nose by the situation which ensued.

I wonder if the Senator realizes that the Members of the Congress of the United States face the problem of not being able to live on their salaries unless those salaries are augmented.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the point of view expressed by my good friend from West Virginia, and I give him assurance that before I complete my remarks I will have answered his questions, because I had them all in mind before I began. But I have certain specific suggestions as to the points which he has raised.

I wish to go back to the fallacious argument by analogy, which we find on pages 37 and 38 of the Segal report, and to point out that I do not think it is sound reasoning to argue that because the presidents and general counsel of 46 American railroads earn an average of $30,590, the Members of the Senate should earn $22,500. I do not understand the cause-to-effect relationship in that kind of reasoning. The two classes are not comparable. It is the difference between compensation in private industry, and compensation for public service to the people of the United States, which, in my judgment, ought not to contain dollar signs of excessive profit.

Let me say something about the cost of living in Washington, D. C. I do not know how it developed in American life that a person coming to the Senate could not live up to the prestige and dignity of the position unless he paid $400, $450, or $500 a month rent for a swank apartment in a Washington, D. C., hotel. If he wants to do that, it is his business. But I think it happens to be the people's business when he tries to argue that because he pays that kind of rent, the people ought to pay him a higher salary.

There are many fine homes in the metropolitan area of Washington which are available at very low and reasonable rental, which Senators can rent, if they wish to rent them, or buy, if they wish to buy. I am simply old-fashioned enough to believe that Senators would be much nearer the spirit of the American people if they lived in that kind of domicile than in swank hotels; but that is their business, not mine.

I shall not vote on the floor of the Senate for a salary increase on the basis of the argument that living costs in Washington are high because Senators pay very high-priced rents in very swank hotels. They do not have to live there. If they want to live in such accommodations, let them do so at their personal expense, not at the people's expense. Thus I say that much of the argument based upon the so-called high cost of living in Washington, D. C., is of the making of Members of Congress.

There was a time when I leaned to the idea of a salary increase for Members of Congress. There was a time, before I gave thorough and adequate analysis to the problem, and listened to the pros and cons in greater detail, that I thought a persuasive case had been made for an increase in salary for Members. But I have changed my view in favor of a proposal I shall make before I finish, which has to do with the payment of the legitimate expenses of a Senator's office. In many instances a Senator has to go into his own pocket to pay for services rendered his constituents. I believe that expenses of this type should be borne by the Senate. They should not come out of the Senator's pocket.

I have completely changed my earlier point of view on this salary increase issue. I do not believe that any substantial increase in salary can be justified at the present time.

There are other high-cost items in the living expenses of colleagues in the Senate, which I think are matters of their own personal choice; they are not necessary to the job. If Members wish to come to Washington and live according to that standard of living, that is their business. I do not begrudge it. Each man to his own liking when it comes to his standard of living, within his pocketbook.

But I submit that on the basis of the salary we receive, omitting from consideration for the moment the item of the expenses of our offices over and above what the Government allows, United States Senators can come to Washington, D. C., and represent their constituencies with dignity and prestige on the salaries now paid them. Therefore, I wish to dismiss, so far as my argument is concerned, and very early in the discussion, the contention of the proponents of the bill that a salary increase is needed in order to meet increases in the cost of living. I say respectfully and goodnaturedly, but sincerely, that if this is the primary reason given for the salary increase, our constituencies have the right to ask us to lower some of our living expenses in Washington, rather than to be asked to give us a salary increase which will pay for higher living expenses.

I wish to make this additional comment in connection with the information on pages 37 and 38 of the Commission's report, which states that "the mean net income of all nonsalaried lawyers in 1951 was $8,730."

I should like to see the study from which that conclusion was drawn, because I am satisfied the records will show that between 75 and 80 percent of American lawyers do not gross $15,000 a year; and they are good lawyers. But if the argument by analogy is to be made on the basis of the income of American lawyers, let me say that, in my judgment, we are not entitled to an increase in salary. A good many lawyers in our home constituencies, who are grossing from $7,500 to $12,500 a year, are as able as any of us in Congress who are lawyers. The idea that in Congress is to be found the cream of the legal profession of the United States is a mistaken notion. There are good lawyers here. Some of us might get up to average; most of us are country lawyers. But on the basis of the alleged legal ability of the lawyers in Congress, it is mere puffing when the argument is made that they could earn more money in the private practice of the law. Most of them did not earn more before they became Members of Congress, and they will not when they return, except perhaps for a couple of years when there may be some friends who think that former Members can give them some special service because of their congressional connections. But I have followed the history of such persons. A good many of them have practiced a little in a kind of combined private practice and lobby practice, and then have ended up back in their home States, earning for the most part not more than they earned before they came to the Senate. Usually that was far short of $15,000 a year.

Of course, it is quite assuring, self-comforting, and pleasant, wishful thinking for one, in his imagination, to associate himself with the general counsel of railroads, as we see on page 38 of the report, and with the general counsel of great American corporations, and to seek to leave the impression that because those lawyers earn so much money as general counsel of large corporations, therefore a lowly Member of the Senate or the House, from the standpoint of legal stature, should be similarly paid. I do not accept that argument by analogy. I repeat, there are exceptions, but the speaker is not one, and would be the first to say he is not one.

By and large, the lawyers in Congress would do very well to gross $15,000 a year in private practice. If some of us were to be put on oath in regard to our gross income before we came to the Senate, we would have to testify that we never grossed $15,000.

From that fact, Mr. President, I argue that we ought to cut our budgets and cut down our costs of living to such a point that we can live within $15,000 a year, so far as our personal expenses are concerned, and put our children through school—and it can be done on that salary.

We should then face up to the real problem which I think confronts Congress, namely, the expenses of the office, over and above the budget allowance that is made available to us by the Government.

I wish to reiterate, because I desire that it be made a part of the RECORD, a contention made by the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], which I thought was an exceedingly able argument, with which I wish to associate myself by reference, as well as many of the arguments made by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], earlier this

afternoon, and the arguments of other spokesmen in opposition to the bill.

Somehow, there is something wrong—wrong from the standpoint of doing the right thing toward others in our citizenry—for us to sit here considering this bill and proposing to vote ourselves a 50-percent salary increase, when we know, first, the budget problem which confronts our Government; second, the labor problems which confront our Government; and, third, the declining income of the farmers of America.

It has been pointed out that we are having trouble obtaining a 5-percent increase in salaries for postal workers. There is a general Government employee wage increase bill confronting us. It has not been determined what final action will be taken, but the consensus is that Government employees will be lucky if a bill gets through the Congress containing more than a 10-percent increase. There are even persons who think there should not be any increase. When there is talk in the cloakrooms of a compromise on a 5 to 7 percent increase for Federal employees, how do my colleagues think it is going to look, from the standpoint of plain fairness to our constituencies, for us to vote for a 50-percent increase in congressional salaries as provided in the Senate bill or a 66-percent increase as provided in the House bill, and then really have serious trouble getting a 5 percent increase for postal workers and a 5 to 7 percent increase for other Government employees?

Then there confronts the Senate the problem of a minimum wage bill. Some of our colleagues have offered a proposal for a minimum wage increase to $1.05 an hour, and there are reactionary forces in the country which are trying to convince the American people it is a socialistic proposal. I am presently inclined toward a minimum wage bill providing for $1.10. On the basis of the most recent evidence I have received, although I have not completed my analysis, I may suggest a bill proposing a minimum wage of $1.15. But look at the opposition in the Congress of the United States to a minimum wage bill which seeks an increase from 75 cents an hour to 90 cents, or to $1, or to $1.10, or to $1.15, or to $1.25, which are the various proposals in the legislative incubator at the present time. Vitriolic is some of the opposition. Highly excitable some persons become if one suggests an increase in the minimum wage. It is said we would destroy industry, or socialize it.

Then if there is suggested an increase in minimum wage coverage, that is said to be the last straw. We are told we must not do anything which would bring under a decent minimum wage law the clerks in the retail establishments of America. Yet we know, as we study the effect of wage cycles, Mr. President, that when the minimum wage is increased, the tendency is to increase the wage structure all along the line, including the wages of employees not covered by Federal interstate commerce acts. I shall be heard to speak on that subject at some length at a later time, Mr. President, but we ought to enact Federal legislation which would take full cognizance of the fact that setting good Federal standards would increase minimum standards in the States, and that a good many States would in turn enact State minimum wage laws. Of course, in many instances such State minimum wage laws would not be essential, because employers, in order to compete in the labor market, would automatically increase minimum wages to thousands of employees who are not now covered by the Federal law, and who could not be covered by Federal law because they do not fall within the interstate commerce jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, my argument on that point is that I do not think we would look good. I do not think our legislative posture would be very becoming in the eyes of the voters of America, if we voted ourselves a 50-percent increase in our own wages, and then fussed and fumed about legislation which proposes an increase in the minimum wage.

Last week I traveled to my home in Oregon. On the way there, between Tangent, Oreg., and Eugene, Oreg., our automobile ran out of gas. We finally succeeded in having a gas truck supply the car with a little gas, which was sufficient until we got to a small gas station. The station was one of those little family gas stations which husband and wife operate in conjunction with a small grocery store or a few tourist cabins. The proprietor, a man in his sixties, said, "Well, Senator, I see that you are about to vote yourselves a nice, big, fat salary increase." I said, "That is very doubtful." "Well, he said, "the bill just passed the House." I said, "Yes, but it has not passed the Senate yet. It may be that it will, but not with my vote." I gave him some of my reasons why I shall vote against the increase, as I am giving them to the Senate this afternoon. That gentleman said, "I want you to know that in this community the people I have talked to, and many come through here during the course of a day, are very bitter about this proposal." He said, "I don't want to hurt your feelings, but we think the Congress as a whole just does not deserve higher pay." I was inclined to agree with him, and I do agree with him, Mr. President.

If we do not want to represent the will of the American people, we should not be here, and if my colleagues would like to find out what the will of the American people is on this question, let us give the people 90 days of all the special education it is desired to give them. Let us postpone action on the bill for 90 days, with the understanding that we will call upon the media of information in this country to inform the American people about all the alleged supporting arguments contained in the report on congressional salaries—I shall have something to say about judicial salaries in a moment—and then let the people express their will on the question. What a walloping we would take. What a turndown we would have in a national referendum on the proposal, Mr. President.

If my colleagues think that all these editorials which have been bound together, which I hold in my hand, will succeed in changing the viewpoint of the rank and file of the voters of this country, then my colleagues are laboring under the misapprehension that the American people pay much attention to the editorial writers when it comes to political policies. Most people know that too many editorial writers in this country are the fronts of reactionary indoctrination forces in America. The American people are doing their own thinking on political issues, and the editorial writers are not doing it for them. When one tries to tell the American people that a United States Senator is entitled to an increase from $15,000 to a $22,500, or, as the House thought, to $25,000, he will find most of the people laugh and snort at him.

Mr. President, I believe that if I voted for the increase, I would not be voting in accordance with the desires of the people of my State. I am perfectly willing to enter into an understanding that the Senate postpone action on the proposal for 90 days, and wait for the reaction of the people of our States after they have been informed of the facts. When it comes to a question of studying the merits and demerits of the report on the bill, I think an overwhelming majority of the people will continue to hold to what I honestly believe is their present opinion, namely, that they are against the proposal. I think that most of them would be inclined to agree with the views I have expressed here today, that Members of Congress could very well do a little personal financial pruning of their own, and when they can demonstrate that they are living within the brackets of reasonable expenditures in Washington, D. C., and that they need more money in order to meet living costs of the job, the people will be fair about it. But to date a convincing record of that need has not been made either in the Commission's report or, in my judgment—and I speak respectfully—in the debate.

So, Mr. President, because I think the proposed salary increase would be entirely out of line with increases which are even suggested for other economic groups in the Nation, I shall vote against the bill.

I have already had something to say about the salaries of lawyers and the salaries of the heads of corporate organizations, including farm organizations. My statement has been to the effect that I do not think they constitute sound arguments by analogy, applicable to the pending bill.

Now let me say a word about the salaries of doctors. Even the Commission's report points out that the average income of doctors in 1951 was $13,432. The Commission pointed out that when doctors attain the age 40 or later, their income increases to $20,000 or $25,000, on an average; and that after doctors reach 50 years of age, their income is even higher.

Mr. President, are we really taking the position that, because members of the medical profession on the average receive an income close to ours as politicians, and that after years of service in the medical profession they receive larger incomes, therefore our salaries should be greater? I have talked to a

good many doctors about this matter and other matters. When we listen to them speak of their problems of professional expense, over and above their living costs and the cost of educating their children; and when we think of their costs for equipment and laboratories and their costs for technicians and assistants, we know that we are dealing with a substantial private-entrepreneur problem in the American private-enterprise system. When we think of the economic, private-enterprise worries which go along with a typical practitioner of medicine—even though many of us get the idea that all the average doctor does is cut economic clover all the time; but that is not what he does, Mr. President—I wish to say that I believe we are very presumptuous to compare our economic problems with those of the average doctor. For that matter, I believe we are rather presumptuous when we compare ours with those of most of the professions.

But what I wish to stress, above all else, is that we chose to enter public service. In choosing to do that—as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] said earlier in the afternoon—we did it with our eyes open; and we should not have done it if what we expected to make out of it was a financial profit.

Now I come to a discussion—I shall discuss them first, and shall submit them later—of a series of amendments which I propose to submit before this debate is over. These amendments deal with the problem of the legitimate, public-service expenses of operating a Senator's office.

We know what happens; we know that many Members of the Senate cannot meet the expenses of their offices with the budget which is allowed them by the Federal Government. There are various reasons for that situation. Among them are the individual differences between Senators as to the kind of service they undertake to render their constituents. But whatever may be the reasons for the differences among us in respect to the type of service we render our constituents, the fact of the matter is that in a great many instances Senators spend considerable sums of money in addition to the amount provided them by the Federal Government for the operation of their offices. In fact, I must say, although there probably are some Senators who are not in this category—I have not talked to all Members of the Senate—that among all my colleagues with whom I have talked about this matter, I have yet to find one Senator who does not say that during each year he reaches into his own pocket and pays out of his own income certain expenses of his office which are not covered by the budget allowed him by the Federal Government. I think that is wrong. I do not believe our constituents expect that of us. In my opinion, our constituents are perfectly willing to have us vote for ourselves the necessary allowances required if we are to render good service to our constituents. I think the matter should be an open book, and that those expenses should be audited, and should be a public record, and should be subject to the inspection of both our constituents and the press. In fact, Mr. President, some of my amendments deal with the problem of public disclosure.

However, at this time I wish to dwell a little longer on the question of the type of services we render our constituents and the type of services they have a right to expect us to render at a cost over and above the expense allowances which attach to our office.

For example, let us consider the matter of clerical help. Each year, a great many Members of the Senate pay out of their own pockets, for clerical help, a considerable sum of money, over and above the amount allowed them for that purpose by the Federal Government. In that connection, some Senators average, each year, an amount equal to the salary of 1 clerk or 1 stenographer. Some of us pay, each year, an amount equal to the salary of several clerks and stenographers; and I have been told that one Member of the Senate hires as many—although the figure varies from time to time—as from 5 to 7 extra secretaries and clerks, in order to do the job of representing his State, as a Member of the Senate of the United States. He happens to be a very wealthy man, and he can afford to do it and to pay that amount out of his own pocket.

However, I do not think it is wise to have such a state of affairs exist; I do not believe it is in the interest of good government to operate the Senate of the United States on so small a budget for senatorial offices that a Member of the Senate feels required to hire as many as 5 or 7 extra clerks or stenographers or secretaries in order to be able to serve his State in the way he considers to be proper.

Mr. President, I am not taking the position that the matter should be left entirely to the discretion of individual Senators, for that would lead to abuses, and would endanger the system, and would lead to the possibility of the development of corruption in connection with senatorial expenses. There simply is no substitute for public disclosure; there simply is no substitute for auditing. However, Mr. President, the premise on the basis of which I argue on this point is that the people of the country are entitled to receive from their Senator such service as they need, in order to have the public business properly conducted; and they should expect to pay—and I am satisfied they are willing to do so—a sufficient amount to cover the cost of that service. I believe we should provide the people with the facts and information showing that more money is needed, by way of expenses, in order to provide that service. Let us require a public accounting each year, so that Senators will not have to say, as they now say—and with justification, Mr. President—"I have to dig into my own pocket, and pay for from 1, 2, 3, or even as many as 7"—7 is the highest figure I have heard—"extra clerks and secretaries a year, in order to run my office in the service of the people of my State."

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to vote to grant to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration jurisdiction to pass judgment, in advance of such expenditures, on the question of whether a Senator can show cause for employing, as assistants in his office, more than the number he is allowed under the present budget.

So, Mr. President, I shall submit an amendment—although at this time I shall state only its essence—proposing a 10-percent increase in the budget item for senatorial office salaries, but without change in the present statutory limits as to the amount of salary per person. The amendment provides for a 10-percent increase in the office budget as the minimum which should be allowed by way of an increase for senatorial office expense. That additional allowance would not go into the pockets of the individual Senator; but would be of assistance, as it should be, to Senators who at present are paying out of their own pockets for extra secretarial help, not for political purposes, but for the purpose of conducting the affairs of their office in behalf of the people of their States.

When we come to the amendment itself—and I shall make a further argument on it at that time—it will be seen that I have protected the public interest by an accountability provision. However, I shall accept any other phraseology or any addition to the amendment, if any Senator believes that greater protection on this point needs to be given to the people.

In addition, there are extra expenses in the offices of many Senators with regard to telephone and telegraph services. I believe it is wise as a rule of thumb to have a limit placed on them, either as to the minutes of long-distance calls per month, or as to the number of calls. I have a similar thought with respect to the number of telegrams and the total cost of the telegrams and the content of the telegrams.

I quite agree with the statement made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], during the last session of Congress, to the effect that some practices were developing in the Senate in connection with telegraph usage which involved public waste. As I recall, at the time a proposal was made by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which the Senator from Arizona was a member, that some limitation be placed on the nature of the contents of telegrams. I have no quarrel with that at all.

Let us take up now a few specific problems which result in many of us paying out of our own pockets money for telegrams and long-distance telephone calls which are justifiable expenditures in transacting public business. I am 3,000 miles away from my constituents. The Senator from Arizona is a good many miles away from his constituents. Let us suppose that a constituent is having passport trouble. He calls his Senator. He calls him collect. Of course, a Senator does not have to accept such a call. However, who among us would not accept it?

The State Department is giving a constituent trouble, and he believes it can be very easily cleared up with the presentation of certain facts, if they are properly called to the attention of the State Department. He feels that is the kind of services he pays taxes for, and he calls his Representative or Senator in an

effort to try to get the hardship alleviated. The Senator goes to the State Department and finds that there is an important fact which the constituent did not tell him. What is the Senator going to do? Will he send a letter by frank to his constituent, or will he send the letter by air mail, or will he use the telephone to call his constituent?

Some constituents talk even longer than Senators, believe it or not, and some of those long distance calls are not very easy to terminate, because the constituent is rather excited. That costs money.

A good many of us in giving that kind of service—and we ought to give that kind of service—dig down into our pockets a good many times each year and pay for such telephone calls, or for sending telegrams in such cases. That is money spent by us over and above what the Government allows us. When the American people come to understand that kind of problem, I believe they will not object to an increase in our allowance for telephone calls and for telegraph services, provided such allowance is subject to inspection, so that it can be made certain that the calls are official calls, made in the transaction of official Senate business.

Let me now refer to the parsimonious policy we have followed with regard to the stamp allowance. A constituent who lives 3,000 miles from Washington cannot understand why he should hear from his Senator by franked mail on a matter of great concern to him, involving his relations with the Federal Government. I am not talking about letters we receive when pressure drives are put on. At such times we receive hundreds of letters from constituents with respect to how constituents think we should vote, or asking questions as to why we voted as we did on some issue.

Of course, we handle many of our replies by franked mail, and many of us even find it necessary to handle some of our correspondence by mimeographed letters, because frequently the correspondence is so voluminous. I am talking about a legitimate problem in connection with which a constituent asks for services. If he lives a great distance away, or even if he lives anywhere where air mail can reach him more quickly than a franked envelope can reach him, I believe it is to be expected that we should air-mail a letter to him. Many of us find it necessary time and time again to supplement our stamp allowance out of our own pockets. We do not have to worry about constituents not being perfectly willing to supply us with a stamp allowance sufficient to take care of our official business by air mail where in our wise discretion—and we always hope it is wise—we decide that an air mail stamp is necessary on the envelope.

This is why I am offering an amendment—and I believe it is the minimum, and I believe it will solve the problem for most of us—of a 10-percent increase not only in the telegraph and telephone allowance but in the stamp allowance as well.

As to stationery, I believe that matter is adequately handled at the present time. However, we know what we do. We get our stationery from our committee. We do not get much of it from our stationery allowance. We also know, because we get our stationery from our committee, that in some instances we have a refund on the stationery allowance. There have been times when I had a surplus and it was refunded to me. As we all know, we report it as income on our income-tax return.

I believe that hole should be plugged. I think it should be stopped. I believe a transfer of funds should be permitted. It should be kept a matter of public record, but if a Senator does not use all the money in the stationery fund, because he is able to get his stationery from a committee, he ought to be allowed to transfer the amount to his stamp allowance or to his telegraph and telephone allowance, provided he can show that he has spent the money for senatorial and not for political purposes.

I do not believe that the refunds which Senators sometimes receive on their stationery allowance are proper refunds. I believe that practice ought to be stopped. I believe the excess ought to be transferred and used in other ways, because we know in advance that we may not use all of it, and therefore we ought to be able to use it for other expenses in our offices, expenses of a senatorial nature, instead of being allowed to take it as a personal refund.

Therefore I have a proposal for a 10-percent increase in the so-called supply feature of Senator's offices with the understanding that it will not cover stationery.

We have another expense, too. It is a delicate issue. These are nip and tuck pros and cons to this expense item, about which I have talked before on the floor of the Senate in years gone by, when I discussed the salary problem. I refer to the matter of receiving a tax credit for the extra living expenses in Washington for maintaining two homes.

I hope Senators will not take offense at a personal illustration, but I cannot prove the point better than by a personal illustration. Some years ago when Miss Strauss was the president of the League of Women Voters and we were talking about legislative programs for the League of Women Voters, I said, "Miss Strauss, why don't you get 3 or 5 Senators and 3 or 5 Representatives to volunteer to be legislative guinea pigs for 1 year, and have them agree to submit to you, or to a committee to be appointed by the League of Women Voters, all their financial problems, public, and personal, such as the cost of the baby's shoes, the cost of educating a daughter or son in college, the cost of living in Washington, and the cost of the senatorial office, and then prepare a treatise which will really present the facts to the American people with respect to what it costs to serve them in the Congress of the United States?"

In my judgment, such a study would have had some value. I speak most respectfully when I say I do not believe the report of the Segal Commission, so far as congressional salaries are concerned, has much value. I say that because it does not give to the American people a breakdown in the expenditure problems which confront Senators and Representatives serving them in the Congress of the United States. Until the American people see it all broken down, item by item, we are going to encounter a great deal of opposition even to an expenditure increase.

Does the Senate think for a moment that I am not aware of the fact that I am going to be criticized by some for proposing an expense increase for conducting senatorial business? If anyone thinks for a moment that my opposition—and there are those, of course, who are always certain to attribute some ulterior motive—is only political opposition, they are dead wrong, because I am offering some amendments with respect to increasing the allowance for expenses in our offices to which many voters will object, just as much as they object to salary increases, because they do not understand the facts in regard to what is involved in such items as I have discussed thus far in my speech.

Certainly, they are not going to understand unless we can get the facts to them, together with the breakdown information with respect to the item I now mention. That is why I say I am willing to make myself a legislative guinea pig in the matter of the cost of maintaining two homes.

As a result of a great deal of thrift over the years and a great deal of hard work, my wife and I succeeded in building a home on a small acreage. It was then, we thought, far out in the country, at Eugene, Oreg. Now our eastern boundary is the city limits. It is a little more than 29 acres, with a rather large house which was built in the depths of the depression at a very economical price. We are renting it furnished for $125 a month. If I had the same house in Washington, on the same lot, I would have no trouble in renting it for $400 a month.

Of course, good family economy called upon me to sell that house when I was first elected to the Senate. But I am not completely stupid politically. There is not a Senator present—and I see smiles on the faces of some—who does not agree with me. I cannot think of a better act of political suicide than to sell a domicile at home and come to Washington and take up a domicile here, and hear the comment, "He does not have a grassroot left in his State."

So we did not sell our home. I am not so sure there is not a little political cowardice involved. I am not particularly proud that I engaged in that kind of economic waste. It is an economic waste, because I took a loss and have taken it ever since I have been in the Senate; I have taken a loss every month on that piece of property. Good economy really would justify my selling it. There was a time when I could have sold it at a pretty good price. Now, with the passage of years, and my not being there to take care of it, it deteriorates in spite of the fact that we have had very careful and cooperative tenants.

Mr. President, that is one of the inescapable costs of service in the Congress. Again, I do not think that if the people of the country understood all of the facts, they would want us to suffer such financial loss. That is why I am

perfectly willing to offer the amendment which I am going to offer in regard to a deduction of the difference between the living costs at home and the living costs in Washington. Such an allowance is common in business. Some Senators live at the Mayflower, the Sheraton, and the Shoreham—and they are very lovely living quarters in Washington—but a good many corporations also keep year-around apartments in those same palatial establishments, and such corporations deduct their cost as business expenses.

There was a time, in the early days of my service in the Senate, before the officials of these corporations were fully apprised as to my political philosophy and policies, when they made very clear to me that if I should be confronted with a situation in which there was a constituent in town, and homeless for the night, I could give them a ring and they would find a place for him in one of those year-around apartments. Let me say that they never received such a call from me. After a little while, when I started writing my record in the Senate, I did not get any more such suggestions.

What I want to point out, however, Mr. President, is that for members of business that kind of a living cost in Washington, D. C., is carried as a tax deduction. Under many circumstances it is a legitimate business expense. I do not quarrel with that. I do not know all the facts about it, I am frank to say, and I think the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would be a much better witness on this subject that I am; but I have my suspicions, on the basis of some information which has been given to me from time to time, that some of those tax allowances to business are exorbitant and unnecessary, just as are some advertising allowances. It is in connection with a tax bill, and this is not the time, that we should discuss proposals for amendments to the tax law that would at least squeeze a little bit of the water from the expense accounts of some American corporations and businesses which have tended to make a bit of a racket of extra living costs in Washington, D. C., when they engage year-around apartments in palatial hotels.

And here, again, Mr. President, we are dealing with a problem of degree. There is a bracket of legitimacy in the subject matter, and I think it is legitimate when it can be shown that the expenditure is a necessary business expense for American business to be allowed this kind of a deduction. It is also proper for us in the pending bill to adopt an amendment which would permit Members of the Congress to deduct for the so-called double living standard. I hope that phrase will not be misinterpreted. I mean a double living standard because we have to maintain a home in our own hometown and also a home in Washington, D. C. We should be allowed to deduct a reasonable amount for that extra expense in Washington.

It should be an amount that requires proof. Therefore, my amendment proposes a figure of $5,000. In many instances Senators who are living in very modest establishments, as many of us do, find that the extra expenses of living in Washington and the maintenance of a home in the home State amount to much more than $5,000. Where we can show it, where it will meet the requirements of an audit, where proof is established, I think it is only fair and just that it be allowed.

When the people get the facts about that, when they understand the equities and the fairness of it, I do not think they are going to quarrel about such an allowance. I think they will approve of it with enthusiasm.

So I have that amendment, Mr. President, which I shall discuss later at some length, during the night, if necessary, because I think it is important to have a thorough discussion of the subject matter. The Senate ought to have time to consider it and the country should have at least until Wednesday to hear about it. With Washington's Birthday tomorrow, I take it for granted that the leadership would not want to vote on the question tomorrow if we do not vote on it tonight. In fact, I shall pause long enough, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor, to ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] if he has any plans he can announce as to the disposal of this bill; whether at this hour we can have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Wednesday and adjourn tonight at a reasonable hour. I assure the Senator that I have canceled my New York engagement, so I am speaking from no selfish motive.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The acting majority leader is in a better position now to state what the program will be for tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. And for tonight, too, I hope.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Tomorrow there will be no legislative business. There will be the usual morning hour following the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator contemplate having the Senate remain in session an indefinite period tonight, with the intention of voting on the bill before we adjourn?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I know of no decision that has been reached at this time. It would be a little easier to make a determination after ascertaining the extent of the speaking of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I am trying to help the Senator with now. That is why I have asked for protection of my right to the floor. I desired to see if we could have this discussion.

I wish to be very honest and frank with the Senator. I do not think it would be in the public interest to vote on the bill tonight. I shall do the best I can to encourage the Senate to vote on Wednesday. Therefore, I think we would probably avoid much unnecessary muscle tension, and would keep ourselves in a jovial, cooperative mood if we could reach some gentleman's understanding now to vote as of a definite hour on Wednesday.

I doubt very much that the Senate would wish to stay in session long into the night, because I have many amendments to offer, and in fairness to the amendments I shall take considerable time to discuss each of them.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Am I correct in my understanding that about the same length of time would be required on Wednesday as on Monday?

Mr. MORSE. No. The Senator is quite wrong about that. Senators can disagree with me, but that is all right. They can disagree with my purpose and my feeling about the matter. I simply do not think it to be in the best interests of the Senate or the country to vote on the bill on the first day it comes before the Senate, and even before some amendments have been printed and are on the table.

I speak most respectfully when I say that I do not believe there is any urgency in the matter. We do not have a calendar which is jammed. We do not face such a situation that it would be against the public interest if we entered into an agreement to vote on Wednesday.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Kentucky would not for one moment question the motive or purpose of the Senator from Oregon in connection with the bill or any amendment he wishes to offer in connection therewith.

The acting majority leader certainly is in no position at this time to make a unanimous-consent request, in view of the fact that a number of other Senators desire to offer amendments, and it would take some time for me to get in touch with all of them. I shall do that as the time passes.

Mr. MORSE. It is likewise my understanding that a number of Members still wish to discuss the matter. It is also my understanding—and the Senator can correct me if I am wrong—that there is a rather large number of absentees tonight; and although a quorum could be obtained at any time an attempt was made to get a quorum, there would not be a large number over a quorum. I happen to believe that if that is a fact—and I have been advised that it is—then we ought to let the bill go over until Wednesday, although there is always the possibility that on Wednesday there may not be any more Senators present than are present now. But, at least, they will have had due notice by Wednesday that a vote will be taken.

I have been told, I think accurately, that some Senators are away who were not aware, when they went away, that there would be a vote on this bill today.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I wish to keep the record straight.

Mr. MORSE. I want it to be straight.

Mr. CLEMENTS. All Members have had notice since Friday that the bill would be taken up today. I also wish to advise the Senator from Oregon that it is my understanding that about the same number of Senators will be present on Wednesday as reported for duty today.

Mr. MORSE. But it is true, is it not, that many of those who are away, although they were advised that the bill would be taken up today, were not of the impression that it would be voted on today. At least, those who expected to be absent on Wednesday will have time between now and Wednesday in which to

change their plans, just as I have changed my plans for tonight.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I believe all Members of the Senate were notified as much as 10 or 12 days ago that the first controversial business to be considered after Lincoln week would be taken up today.

Mr. MORSE. But being so advised, and this being such a highly controversial matter, I wonder if they were not almost entitled to take judicial notice of the fact that the bill would not be disposed of on the first day.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The acting majority leader has had no complaint from Members on this side of the aisle up until now.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to have the Senator's viewpoint. He is having the experience of a complaint for the first time from this side of the aisle. It probably will not be the last complaint, either. [Laughter.] I never deal my cards under the table; they are always face up.

I wish to say that I always love my association with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. If this is to be the insistence of the acting majority leader for the rest of the evening, let us proceed, and may a good time be had by all, because I have much to say on this subject matter.

Mr. President, my amendment in regard to the deduction for tax purposes would be, as I have said, at a figure of $5,000. I desire to tell the Senate how I came to determine that figure. I talked to a good many of my colleagues in regard to their expenses, including the so-called double-home expense, a Senator's expense of maintaining a home in his own State and of maintaining a home in Washington. I satisfied myself that the figure of $5,000 was a reasonable and equitable one.

I then talked to professional staff members, who are familiar with the problem, and without taking any sides on the merits of the issue, but only giving me information as to the figure itself, they said they believed a figure of $5,000 was equitable.

Then I talked to a firm of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, who are familiar with the tax problems of Members of Congress. I was told that in the handling of tax accounts of Members of Congress, the present figure of $3,000 is entirely too low. Some of the members of the firm even thought that a figure higher than $5,000 would be justified.

Then I talked to the certified public accountant who handles my own tax affairs. All I wish to quote him as saying is that he thought it certainly was a fair figure, but he was not passing judgment at all upon the legislative merits or demerits of the general proposal.

I think this amendment would take care of the equities in the whole matter of expense adjustment, and would leave a salary at what I think is a reasonable figure for service in Congress, namely, $15,000 a year.

While I am on that point, let me reply briefly to an argument I heard this afternoon about increases in the cost of living. I have had a great deal to do in my professional life with the studying of wage standards. I shall review very briefly some of the criteria which are taken into consideration in the fixing of wage standards.

The fundamental criterion is that American wage earners are entitled to a wage of health and decency. It is a very general principle; it is a very general measuring rod; but it is a measuring rod which has taken on the meaning of art in the trade. By that I mean in the whole field of industrial relations. The measuring rod or standard of health and decency has come to have very definite limits of meaning. Included within its meaning is the conception that an American is a free man, working under an economic system that protects his economic and political freedom of choice; that he is entitled, in a wage negotiation, to receive a wage award that will permit him to enjoy a wage of health and decency. What is that standard? In each individual case it is determined by the record made before the wage board, the mediator, or the arbitrator. In broad outline, it can be described as a wage that permits him to earn an income sufficient to feed, clothe, and house his family on what is recognized in the community as a level of decency. It is somewhat like the rule of reasonableness in the law courts. No lawyer can define with measuring-rod exactness what the rule of reasonableness is. And yet every lawyer knows that judges use it constantly. They take the whole case from its four corners, study the record, look at the testimony and the evidence, and then they are heard to say, "In applying the rule of judicial reasonableness, the court finds."

That is the way basic wages are determined in a wage case, Mr. President, The arbitrator, or whoever has the solemn responsibility of adjudicating the wage dispute, says, "I am bound to fix a wage that will at least meet the minimum standards of health and decency, so that a worker can clothe, house, and feed himself and an average family." Usually in wage cases the average family is the hypothetical family of four. The arbitrator must say to himself that such a worker must be able to clothe his family, house it, and feed it at the level of decency. Under our system of economic freedom, American wage earners are entitled to that level.

There is always brought into a wage case the old argument whether or not, on the basis of the alleged inability to pay, the arbitrator should hand down a decision which would not permit a wage of health and decency. That was a great contest in the early wage negotiations in America. It is my recollection—I should like to go to the books to check it, but I think my recollection is correct—that there were two great Americans who played an important part in wage negotiations in this country, William Howard Taft and the great Justice Brandeis. These men were among the very first to reject the ability-to-pay arguments on the part of employers, insofar as they concerned a request that the arbitrator or wage board hand down a decision calling for a wage lower than one which would permit a standard of health and decency.

Mr. President, one can well judge that at that time the doctrine was considered a very radical one. But it came to be accepted, and was refined in the years following the great decision of Taft in the War Labor Board report of 1917 or 1918, in which he supported the theory of requiring a wage of health and decency, and rejected the idea that a wage lower than that could be arrived at by a wage board on the basis of an employer's argument of inability to pay.

In some of the refinements which followed the application of the Taft and Brandeis principle on that point, it was pointed out in later decisions that if an employer could not pay a wage of health and decency, it was a negotiable matter between the employer and the workers. The fixing of the wage was a matter of mediation between the employers and the workers, but no representative of the Government, no judicial officer, no officer appointed by the parties to function in a private judicial capacity for them, had any moral right to order that the employees should accept a wage less than one of health and decency.

Of course, that milestone in the development of American wage policy was resisted, and in some reactionary quarters was declaimed as radical, socialistic, and anarchistic. It has come now to be accepted as one of the elementary principles of wage negotiation. Let me emphasize that it is a principle on which the whole theory of minimum wages is based.

Let us consider early minimum wage legislation. I have not done so recently, but I have many times since I have been a Member of the Senate. I read the RECORD, not with amusement, but with some pleasant regard for the almost amusing position in which the reactionaries in the Congress put themselves when minimum wage proposals were first advanced in this great parliamentary body. How I wish that many of them might come back and read the remarks they then made, in view of the great strides for human betterment which have been taken in this country as the result of decent wage standards, which have been developed and have evolved since Taft and Brandeis laid down the very sound economic and social principle that ability to pay should not be considered in the matter of fixing a minimum wage necessary to maintain health and decency. Yet there have been thousands of persons who have simply hated to give up the idea that someway, somehow, the jungle law of supply and demand should be allowed to go on unfettered, unchecked, and uninterfered with by Government even though it would affect the services of human beings who depend upon wages for their very existence.

Had such a philosophy prevailed, in my judgment American labor today would not have the economic freedom of choice which it possesses. Incidentally, business, operating under our system of enlightened capitalism, would not today be enjoying the fruits of a private enterprise system. There would be economic chaos, because business is completely and entirely dependent upon the purchasing power of the mass of the workers.

Great strides have been made since the position taken by William Howard Taft and Justice Brandeis on that point back in the days of World War I. However, I can recall that as recently as 1939, while serving on wage and hour panels, I listened to employer contentions that a 25-cent minimum wage in some industries was all that the Board should have allowed, because the industry did not have the ability to pay more.

Surprising, Mr. President, the readiness with which representatives of industry in those days could make a heart-rending argument about what was going to happen to a business if a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour was allowed under the law, which, of course, is exactly what was done in a great many cases. But proposals for maintaining 25-cent minimum wages occurred as recently as 1939. I remember in 1942, when the laundry case was before the War Labor Board and, believe it or not, Mr. President—it is a public record, and one can read for himself—the argument was made that we should not interrupt or unsettle a 19-cent minimum wage that prevailed in some laundries in 1942. The basis of the argument was that to do so would only cause the housewives of those sections of the country to do their laundry in the cellar. In that decision—which had the unanimous vote of all the members of the board, including both the employer members and the labor members—I was so impolitic as to suggest that the cellar was where the housewives of the Nation should do their laundry, if not doing it there would mean that the laundry workers of the Nation would subsidize the housewives on the basis of a 19-cents-an-hour wage. We substantially increased the wage; and I did not hear that a single laundry went out of business as a result of that wage increase. I do not know it to be a fact, but I simply have a hunch that a good many of the housewives who wrote to me anything but complimentary letters, because of the remark I made about the housewives, kept right on sending their laundry to the laundries. But under that decision the laundry workers got a wage of health and decency. If my colleagues will read that decision, they will find that it revolved entirely around the basic principle of a wage of health and decency, which is the first of the criteria I wish to mention in connection with the fixing of wages.

I now move to the second one, namely, a criterion which deals with fixing a wage over and above one of health and decency. If all the American workers had to look forward to was merely a wage of health and decency, their existence would be a rather dreary one. Moreover, Mr. President, in that event the American economy would be depressed. That is why it is so important for the American employer to understand that it is to his economic interest to pay a wage substantially above one of health and decency.

A wage of health and decency is more than an existence wage, but it is certainly less than a wage which permits the average American family of four to enjoy what we call a good standard of living. Again, that is a flexible criterion. I cannot submit an economic wage ruler, and thus measure this wage in dollars and cents per month or per week or per day or per hour. But here, again, after we have studied all the evidence and all the testimony in the record of a wage case, and when we have the job of making a judicial determination, by applying the rule of judicial reasonableness to the problem before us, we do not have much difficulty in reaching a conclusion as to what wage figure would result in allowing a reasonable wage above one of health and decency, one within the boundary of the ability of the employer to pay, and one which would help promote a good standard of living for the workers involved in the case.

At this point I wish to stress that the only place in the entire wage matter where the ability of the employer to pay is not in any way controlling is in a case involving the criterion of a wage of health and decency. In such a case the ability of the employer to pay is not a controlling factor. That is why it has been pointed out by some of the distinguished wage students I have mentioned—I shall not quote them now from recollection, because I desire to be accurate; therefore, I shall only summarize their position by referring to such great students of this issue as William Howard Taft and Associate Justice Brandeis, of the United States Supreme Court, and the many who followed them, and who accepted the premise I am now discussing—that if the employer cannot pay a wage of health and decency, it is better for the national economy that he go out of business, unless the workers in his plant privately and voluntarily negotiate with him a wage less than one of health and decency; but the Government has no right and an arbitrator has no right and a wage board has no right to say to the worker under such facts, "We will require you to subsidize your employer by accepting wages which result in your living under a standard of living less than one of health and decency."

But, Mr. President, when we reach the second criterion I have mentioned, and when we have to consider a request of the employees that they be granted in such a wage case a standard of living above one of health and decency, the ability of the employer to pay does become an important factor. At that point, the arbitrator or the wage board has to give careful consideration to the ability of the employer to pay.

In such a case what does the arbitrator or the wage board take into account? Let us not forget that I am taking about a situation involving—in the average wage case, if it is one of substance, and if it involves any considerable number of employees—volumes of testimony and exhibits dealing with such factors as comparable wages for similar work in the same area and the labor market, the availability of employees, and competing influences beyond the labor market which are urging upon the community a pirating of the labor supply from a wage market outside the area—in short, a host of such factors. Such a case deals, of course, with the matter of the profits of industry. When we reach that one, Mr. President, we have a "hot one," because in a good many cases the employer is perfectly willing to say, "I cannot pay more." However, when we say, "Let us see your books," we are told that to do so would be a violation of his right of economic privacy.

Mr. President, on that point it has taken time to evolve a change of attitude in American industry. Again I refer to William Howard Taft and Justice Brandeis, who were great leaders in this field. They laid down, in American arbitration law, the very sound principle that when an employer seeks to rest upon the argument of a lack of ability to pay, the wage board or the arbitrator has a right to see his books or to see proof, not merely selected proof, not whatever proof the employed may wish to advance, but all the proof, including the right of the arbitrator or the wage board or the judicial officer to call for all the books, and, if they are not produced, to dismiss the argument that the employer cannot afford to pay; and in the absence of a showing to the contrary, to assume that he can afford to pay.

Although I have a great deal of time at my disposal, I do not wish to take much of it to go into great detail concerning the many conflicts which have developed in connection with evolving a new and accepted point of view in regard to American employers, namely, that if they are to argue that they do not have the ability to pay, then they owe it to the judicial officer who is determining the dispute to give him sufficient evidence of their inability to pay.

On this point we are dealing with a touchy problem of economic privacy, because we must think of the businessman's competitors. I believe we are dealing with a matter of economic privacy when an employer says, "Mr. Arbitrator, I am willing to have you see it, and I am willing, under an arrangement or pledge by counsel for the union or the president of the union of secrecy with regard to the matter, to have the matter considered in executive session, because it is not in the interest of the workers to have all my business secrets from the standpoint of what the books will show made available to my competitors, and it will not help the union to have the matter made public knowledge."

I have always taken the position that under those circumstances I would order an inspection of the books, but not at a public hearing. We would look at the books with only the smallest number of parties present, and only those parties present who would assure the arbitrator getting the full value of the views of the representatives of the labor group from the standpoint of rebutting the contention of the employer in regard to what his books showed.

Under those circumstances, after we have studied the books and the evidence of the ability or inability of the employer to pay a wage over and above a wage of health and decency, we have the problem of evaluating the evidence.

There, again, we have the record from its four corners, and we decide what is a reasonable and fair wage over and above

a wage of health and decency. If our finding shows that the employer has the ability to pay a wage over and above a wage of health and decency, that is not the end. It is not the same as finding that there is a surplus. There are many other criteria to consider. The stockholders must be considered. There are other parties to the wage case, although some labor unions seem to forget it. In many cases which I have considered labor unions seemed to operate on the basis that there were not even 2 parties or 3 parties to the dispute, but only 1 party, the workers. It did not take long for me to dispel that fallacious notion. At other times some labor unions seemed to believe that there were only two parties, the representatives of the workers and the representatives of the employers. They seemed to forget that once they enter such a judicial tribunal there are three parties to a wage dispute, namely, the workers, the employers, and the public, with the public represented by the man in the middle, whether it be the wage board or the Government agency or the private arbitrator, or whoever has been given the solemn responsibility of fixing wages for the industry in connection with the particular case.

Therefore we must give consideration to the rights of the stockholders, and we must give consideration to all the arguments and evidence with regard to what is claimed to be a reasonable and fair profit in an industry, considering the risks that arise in connection with it. We must give consideration, of course, to depreciation allowance needs, and we must give consideration to the need for a reserve, in order to build up the plant from expansion and for greater production later.

All those factors must be considered. However, finally, as Brandeis and Cardozo point out in their discussion of judicial processes—particularly Cardozo in his great work on the nature of judicial processes—we come to the judicial determination which is known in the law as the value judgment of the relative rights of the parties litigant, in view of the full record of the case. Then our judicial sense tells us, "This is the figure." We describe that mental judicial process by such words as "It is a fair figure," or "It is a reasonable figure," or "It is an equitable figure," or "It is a just figure."

We have not evolved in the English language words which are more exact in meaning than the words I have cited for the description of this very solemn and, in a sense—if one is dedicated to judicial processes as we lawyers are—this sacred process of judgment in fixing a wage over and above a wage of health and decency, if the facts warrant it.

We call that a good wage. We call that a wage that takes into account, not luxuries, but entertainment, economic ambitions, and desirable goals, which every man and woman is striving to obtain as we seek to make our system of enlightened capitalism promote the general welfare.

As my colleagues have heard me say before, and although I never like to bore them even in prolonged debate, it is a point that needs to be repeated over and over again, the primary purpose of our great economic system, which we call enlightened capitalism, is to support and always keep strong and high in the arch, without the slightest sagging, that keystone of our whole constitutional system, the promotion of the general welfare.

That is why in years gone by, before many bar associations, when I have discussed the various phases of constitutional law, I have said so many times that the primary objective of our constitutional system is to promote the general welfare. In my judgment we have not even started, in the field of American constitutional law, to give full meaning to the constitutional concepts which are inherent in the general welfare clause of the Constitution. I believe it is the most elastic band in the Constitution. I believe it is the clause which guarantees for generations and generations to come the flexibility and adjustability and adaptability of the Constitution to changing human events in our political society, which we call a representative form of government in a political democracy.

Therefore, as in a wage case we come finally to render a judicial judgment as to what wage should be allowed over and above a wage of health and decency, when the employer is shown on the record to be one who can pay more than a wage of health and decency, we take into account, for example, the need for giving the worker a sufficient share of the profits—oh, what a dangerous phrase that is—in the form of a wage above a wage of health and decency, which will enable him to provide his family with more of the so-called good things of life, which may be a trip to California or Florida or some other sunny clime in our country—a part of the dream world and the justifiable objectives of many American wage earners.

Why not? If the industry can pay it and if the industry is protected by the criteria that I have been enumerating—and I have enumerated only a few of them—such a wage is fixed by the wage board, or arbitrator, the judge, or whoever has jurisdiction to render a judicial determination in the case.

There are other factors which are taken into account in determining that type of wage. It is necessary to consider such matters as reasonable medical care. Under a good wage, or a wage above a wage of health and decency, it is necessary to consider such factors as better medical care and more hospitalization. It does not follow that under a wage of health and decency the worker ought to have his wage so fixed that in case of illness in his family or childbearing on the part of his wife he will be able to pay for a private room in a hospital. However, it does mean that the wage should be sufficiently high to supply medical care and the medical needs of the family.

When we get to the point where the evidence submitted by the representatives of the workers shows that the employer has the ability to pay more than a wage of health and decency, we take these other good things of life into account and recognize that it would be pretty discouraging if every American were not allowed the expectation of an economic livelihood that would permit of the enjoyment of such a wage. But, as I have said, in fixing that wage there are three parties to it: the workers, the employer, and the public. Under those circumstances, also, judicial commonsense dictates that one industry be not moved forward all out of line with other industries simply because it may have an exceptional economic status at the moment.

Believe it or not, Mr. President, when I get toward the conclusion of this speech—and I am a long way from it at the present time; I may finish it tomorrow—I am going to draw it all together and show the direct application of these principles of wage policy to the bill now pending before the Senate, because we happen to be workers for the people, or we should be, and our wage costs, Mr. President, ought to be considered in line with all the criteria which are considered by wage boards, arbitrators, and judicial officers in fixing the amount of income for wage earners generally. Let us not follow the philosophy that we in the Congress of the United States are economic aristocrats. I cannot think of any greater disservice to the American people than for us to adopt the doctrine of economic aristocracy in the Senate of the United States and seek to set ourselves aloof from the rank and file of our fellow citizens. In this field of wage determination and wage adjustment we have no greater economic rights, merely because we are politicians sitting in the Congress of the United States, than have the people in the factories, in the fields, and in the white-collar class of America.

It is nice rationalization for us to try to alibi a 50-percent wage increase for ourselves, to try to put ourselves in an aristocratic class economically when millions and millions of people find themselves subjected to the kind of wage determination criteria about which I have been talking this afternoon.

The reason why I have gone into it in some detail is to try to get the American people—because I am talking to them from this desk this afternoon—to understand that the wage determination criteria which apply to them apply to us also, because we, too, are, or should be, workers in the public interest.

There are some other factors which are taken into account in determining wages under this criterion. I spoke about public hospitalization and more leisure time, and I have pointed out that when industry can afford to pay it, weight should be given to the point raised by the wage negotiators for more money for educational purposes for the average family of four persons.

We hear a great deal from educators of their growing concern because not enough of our young people are going to college to obtain liberal and professional education, or to technical schools for the development of scientific skills. These educators point out, and very rightly so, that we cannot stay ahead of Russia in manpower, but we must see to it that we stay ahead of Russia in brainpower. If we are going to keep America's defenses strong we must keep them strong not only in a military sense, but in a brainpower sense.

So, Mr. President, educators are disturbed about the fact that too frequently not enough of our best young brains have the advantage of higher education. The interesting thing is that heredity draws no distinction among families of the wealthy and families of the poor. History shows very clearly that some of the brainiest of our people come from families of the poor. Of course, Mr. President, it is a terrific national loss whenever we lose a potential nuclear physicist. When we lose the services of a brain that could develop into a great biochemist, it is a tremendous national loss. When we lose the services of a great nuclear engineer, when we lose the services of any potential scientist, or, for that matter, when we lose the brainpower of an individual who could assume leadership in any of the disciplines of learning, it is a tremendous loss. We lose them more in the grade schools. We do not lose them in high schools. In fact, we probably lose them before they start kindergarten. We lose them in great numbers at the home level when the home does not receive an economic income sufficient to start to condition intellectually the brainy child, the child of better than average I. Q., from the time that his propensities can be first noted. Do not forget that if that child is not afforded so-called minimum standards of education in the grade schools that will qualify him for high school education, all that potentiality, all that brainpower will have been lost if he makes a sorry record in high school, if he drops out in high school, or if he becomes discouraged and disillusioned. The interesting thing is that the records of child psychology show that it is the able ones, it is the brilliant ones, it is the ones of better-than-average mind who suffer the most psychologically from discouragement; and we know from our juvenile-delinquency records that a surprisingly large percentage of juvenile delinquents have good I. Q.'s. There are many other causes and many other factors; I mention only one. One of the causes to be found in individual cases is great discouragement because the boy or girl sees no hope for higher education. The family income does not permit of a standard of living in the home above a living of health and decency; it does not permit of the best of education.

Many conditioning factors come into play in the case of the bright boy or girl, as well as the boy or girl of a lower I. Q., which cause him or her, for one reason or another, to leave school early and to take up the economic burden of the family. Thus there is lost the potentiality of a great mind. This is not the way to keep ahead of Russia.

I shall have more to say about this general problem when I come to a discussion of proposed aid-to-education legislation later in this session of Congress. I mention this in passing only because the wage standards and the wage criteria which are applied to American workers determine in no small measure the extent to which we shall protect American brainpower, so far as developing to the maximum the education reservoir of the young people of our country is concerned.

Oh, Mr. President, there are so many interesting facets of this problem that one can be led into a myriad of very interesting channels of discussion when he merely begins to think about the problem of protecting the reservoir of American brainpower to be found in the youth of our land. But all I seek to do at this point in my remarks is to show the direct connection or association of brainpower with an economic income for the average family of our country.

I take the position that where the industry can support it, where the facts show that it has the ability to pay, a share of the profits over and above a wage of health and decency should go to the workers.

But when in a decision one even mentions the phrase "share the profits," he must expect to receive some rather uncomplimentary evaluations of his argument. I do not use the term "profit sharing" in the socialistic sense. We all know there are schools of socialistic thought which advocate a profit-sharing system on a socialistic basis, where the Government operates the industry, in effect, although it may have a managerial entrepreneur service from some so-called industrial group. I am not talking about that kind of profit-sharing at all. I am against it. I am talking about the producers of wealth within private industry, who are the workers as well as the investors.

Too many persons seem to have the idea that it is the owner of the capital who is the producer of the wealth. I do not take the point of view that he is not a producer of wealth, but he is only one factor in the production of the wealth that flows from his industry. The workers produce some of it, too. They are entitled, in that sense, along with the stockholders, along with the owners of the business, to some share of the profits, which would permit a wage above a wage of health and decency. That is the point I desired to stress in connection with the second category of criteria that are taken into account when a wage board, a Government agency, or an arbitrator determines a fair wage.

There is another wage criterion, a third class of wage structure, which sometimes is asked for in wage cases, after a wage of health and decency has been fixed. Even after a so-called good wage has been fixed in an industry, on the basis that the employer has the ability to pay over and above a wage of health and decency, another class of wage cases is frequently involved in wage adjustments. That is a wage which takes care of so-called fringe benefits, a wage that takes care of adjustments in costs of living, about which we have heard so much from our colleagues. So it will be seen that I am gradually getting to the point of the application of these principles to the theory of the pending bill. Just be patient, and I shall get there in my own time and in my own way.

In those wage cases there is a request for an "up" in the wage over and above the so-called good wage, so as to meet the changes in costs of living, or to meet the need for pension benefits, or to meet the need for a so-called security system for the industry or a hospitalization system. The so-called fringe benefits present some perplexing problems to the wage board or the arbitrator or the judge who is called upon to consider the economic rights of employers and workers, and, do not forget, as I said earlier, the public interest as well.

It is very important that we take into account the public interest, particularly when it comes to the matter of fixing so-called fringe benefits over a wage of health and decency and a so-called good wage that takes into account the economic rights of the workers.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, February 23, 1955, after the morning business, during the further consideration of S. 462, a bill to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, debate on the pending amendment proposed by Mr. BUSH, and any other amendment or motion, including appeals, shall be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover thereof and Mr. KEFAUVER: *Provided*, That if Mr. KEFAUVER is in favor of any proposed amendment, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that it not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received: *Provided further*, That when no further amendment is to be proposed to the said Senate bill, the Senate shall, without debate, immediately proceed to the consideration of the companion House bill, H. R. 3828; that it be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of Senate bill 462, if and as amended; and that the engrossment of any amendment that is not germane to the subordered, and the bill read a third time.

Ordered further, That on the question of the passage of the said House bill as amended debate shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided between Mr. KEFAUVER and the minority leader and controlled by them, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall close my remarks in a few minutes.

I wish to apply the wage theory I have been discussing to the bill before the Senate. Cases involving fringe benefits, such as cost of living benefits, or changes in cost of living benefits, have to be determined by the arbitrator in terms of the ability of the employer to pay—and in our case the people of the United States represent the employer—and also in terms of the need when studied from the standpoint of the wage now being paid.

When we consider those two principles, Mr. President, and apply them to

the pending bill, I wish to say that, in my judgment, with our national budget what it is, the people should not be asked to pay these wage increases in the name of changes in the cost of living, because I submit the wage is adequate to meet the cost-of-living problems of Senators, if they will do their share of economizing. Secondly, Members of Congress asked to come to Washington, and I am sure they would be welcomed back home if they did not desire to stay here and work for a wage which certainly is above a wage of health and decency, and above the criterion of a good wage; and the people would have no difficulty in replacing them.

Lastly, I wish to point out, Mr. President, that I think the amendment which is to be offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is a sound one from the standpoint of the criterion of ability to pay, because, until the budget is balanced, I do not think that the wages of Members of Congress should be increased.

So what I have had to say in regard to what is really a summary analysis of the criterion that judges, wage boards, and arbitrators are called upon in American industrial dispute law to apply in fixing wages, is directly applicable to the bill before the Senate.

I am opposed to the bill, Mr. President, so far as congressional salaries are concerned. Under the limitations of time fixed in the unanimous-consent agreement, I shall have something to say in regard to the judicial features of the bill. I now wish to say that the present salary of Members of Congress is a good salary, supplies a good wage, under the criterion which I have outlined this afternoon, and that the claim for an increase on the basis of an adjustment for cost of living is not justified at the present time.

For those reasons in the main, and for many more specific reasons which I shall advance as I discuss individual amendments on Wednesday, I wish the record to show that I am unalterably opposed to the proposal for congressional salary increases at this time.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of amendments, some of which are introduced by me in behalf of myself and my junior colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER]. The last one I have not had an opportunity to discuss with him, and I do not know whether he will join in it, so I shall offer it only on behalf of myself. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed and lie on the table, so that Senators may have them available in printed form when we proceed to discuss them on Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). Without objection, the amendments will be printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would say to the acting majority leader and the acting minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who I am sure very ably represents the minority leader in the Senate, that I deeply appreciate the cooperation which they have extended to the senior Senator from Oregon in connection with the unanimous-consent agreement and further debate on the bill. It is not always pleasant, and it is not easy, as anyone who has tried it well knows, to stand in the Senate and use one's parliamentary rights to protect what one's conscience and judgment tells him is a public interest. I respect the sincerity of those in the Senate who disagree with me at those times, but I respectfully say now that I think it is good for all, for the Senate and for the country, that we have provided for the extra hours that will now be available for a more considerate debate on the pending measure than would have taken place if, with the clock hands pointing at us all the time, it had been sought to push through the Senate tonight to a vote an issue which is so controversial across the land as this issue is. I would certainly be less than appreciative if I did not extend to the majority leader and the acting minority leader my sincere thanks for the cooperation they have extended to me. I hope they will not feel that I unfairly held a parliamentary gun at their heads, because I did not shoot many bullets. I merely pleaded that they would not make it necessary for me to do so.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I wish to assure my friend, the Senator from Oregon, that the acting majority leader is appreciative of the comment which the Senator from Oregon has made. I was not conscious of any parliamentary gun being held at anyone's head. I wish to assure my friend from Oregon that we had no designs by which we could have had either the hour or the minute hand of the clock directed at him. I think it is very fine that we have had three and a half or 4 hours of discussion on this very important measure this afternoon. By reason of having discussed the bill for that amount of time, I think it has given us the opportunity to have the bill passed on Wednesday at a much earlier time than otherwise. In view of the manner in which the bill has been handled, I do not believe that anyone could point a finger of suspicion at any Member of the Senate and suggest there had not been ample opportunity for the bill to be fully explored by the Members of the Senate and by the people of the country as a whole.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for his comments.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 22, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 21, 1955:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provision of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. John Harrison Stokes, Jr., O12181, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Crump Garvin, O12746, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Honnen, O12816, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Francis Uncles, O14914, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Nicholas Young, O15063, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Sherman Timberman, O15328, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edwin Kennedy Wright, O15475, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Raleigh Raymond Hendrix, O15897, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Victor Allen Conrad, O15546, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Francis Marion Day, O15614, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Peter Conover Hains, 3d, O15657, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Vonna Fernleigh Burger, O15667, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Givens Prather, O15693, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Willard Koehler Liebel, O15723, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Henry Maglin, O15812, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur Lawrence Marshall, O38593, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Frank Needham Roberts, O12734, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Andrew Thomas McNamara, O17324, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Keith Richard Barney, O16377, United States Army.

Col. Benjamin Branche Talley, O16668, United States Army.

Col. Charles H. McNutt, O16751, United States Army.

Col. Charles Granville Dodge, O18072, United States Army.

Col. Alva Revista Fitch, O18113, United States Army.

Col. Christian Hudgins Clarke, Jr., O18213, United States Army.

Col. James Knox Wilson, Jr., O18218, United States Army.

Col. William Frew Train, O18415, United States Army.

Col. Robert Quinney Brown, O18520, United States Army.